

Employment Support Bill

exchange of some article. That would not only include what the hon. member had in mind, but many more things as well. It is in the last three lines of that clause, (a) that we are supposed to find a delineation regarding the exact nature and purpose. It reads: are made, fabricated or refined out of raw material or other substance or combination thereof.

I suggest it would take the wisdom of many Speakers and Solomon combined to give us a clear definition of what is intended by the words "are made, fabricated or refined out of raw material". In this day and age when we know so much about processing, growth change, transformation and manufacturing, how can you possibly think that this paragraph in any way limits the scope of this bill and, therefore, the agency to be set up to do whatever it pleases under this bill? It does not quite obviously because whether we have in mind a potato growing in the ground, an apple growing on the tree, a fish swimming in the sea or the process that is involved in respect of growing Irish moss, the process of growth in respect of agriculture, fisheries and forestry, as well as the active part of man's intervention in terms of technological circumstances, cannot be subdivided unless they are clearly indicated. I would say they are far from being clearly indicated under the scope of this legislation. I would adopt the words used by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley in introducing his amendment when he said he was indeed attempting to clarify with certainty. I would say to that extent that in this amendment the hon. member is attempting to help the Chair and assist the House in providing the House with a piece of legislation which may be adequate in respect of the problem presently before us.

• (3:20 p.m.)

At this point I believe I might emphasize the fact that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and others have been very reluctant to speak about the resources of the industries of farming and fishing. I use that word because it is the word that is used in respect of these industries. We are faced with a government which seems to be seeing one side of the problem. The hon. member is trying to give us an amendment which would give us in context the totality of the problem. In view of the complete uncertainty in respect of this legislation, I think members should at least be allowed to make a determination by way of a vote on whether or not this is an acceptable and improved amendment. It is not an amendment which in any way tries to increase the scope of the bill but rather an amendment which tries to clarify and indicate with certainty what this legislation attempts to do. If members are given an opportunity to vote in the normal manner they will be able to say clearly in this House what kind of legislation they want at this point in time when we are faced with the tremendous impact of the United States surtax which will disadvantage many segments of Canadian industry.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support those who seek to have this amendment accepted as part of the bill and as a part of the discussion we are about to undertake. I believe it is proper to define, within this bill and within this amendment, the things we are going to do and hope to do through this measure. If an amendment such as this, which defines the actual products produced as well as those processed were

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

not considered then I believe there would be very considerable difficulty in administering this legislation. In an attempt to define what is processed and what is not processed in this area, we find that there are some pretty fine distinctions and some pretty fine decisions which are involved.

The other thing which I believe is important is that unless some amendment of this nature is added to this bill, we are left without any clear direction in this legislation with regard to a very wide range of agricultural products. I know neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the minister in charge of the Wheat Board are in the House at the present time, so I expect we cannot be advised whether or not in their opinion such an amendment is acceptable. This may or may not be relevant to the discussion, since I am very sure Your Honour's decisions are not made on the basis of acceptance by the other side of the House. However, I do urge, Mr. Speaker, that you give all possible consideration to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rising to address himself to the motion now before the House?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may do so briefly. Perhaps also I should admit that in arguing for the admissibility of this amendment I am putting in one word for it and two words for the next one. Briefly, as I understood Your Honour's remarks from the Chair, you have two questions about the amendment of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan). First, is it an amendment by which a matter of substance is imported not only into the legislation but into the interpretation section and secondly, is the amendment something which goes beyond the scope of the bill as recommended by His Excellency the Governor General. It seems to me those two points are pretty closely tied together. On the first point Your Honour, of course, will have to make the judgment concerning whether the words the hon. member for Annapolis Valley wishes to put in the interpretation section are substantial in character or merely clarifying. I suggest a good case has been made for the fact that they are simply a clarification of the intent of the whole bill.

On the other point concerning whether this amendment goes beyond the recommendation of the Governor General, I repeat what other hon. members have said. The recommendation contains these key words:

—respecting payment of employment support grants to mitigate the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect;—

As hon. members know, people in almost any walk of life or occupation refer to their occupation as an industry. Certainly in western Canada we hear of agriculture referred to all the time as an industry. There is nothing in this recommendation which narrows that at all and as the recommendation is one which suggests the legislation is of concern to Canadian industry I submit it is proper to make clear in the legislation what is meant by industry. Therefore, I hope Your Honour will see fit to regard this amendment as not importing any substance but simply clarifying the intent of the bill.

If by any chance Your Honour should find this amendment offends because it would amend the interpretation