

it is prepared to get tough. At no time has this government ever shown that it is prepared to get tough on the universal dumping program of the United States called DISC. This did not involve just one firm, it involves industry generally. Perhaps if we did not have the present level of foreign ownership in Canada, what the United States has done with the DISC program would not be terribly important. The point is, we do have an enormous level of foreign ownership, particularly in the manufacturing industry, and every time the United States makes a tax change of this kind, Canada has to shake a little bit and respond.

There is only one approach we should be taking. We should serve notice on the U.S. government that we have no intention of permitting it to export its unemployment into Canada which historically has had a higher level of unemployment than the United States. We must show clearly that if the United States brings in tax legislation directed toward this purpose, we will not respond with bribery but with positive government action, and that we will impose a countervailing duty equal to the advantage we think is being offered. If we were to do that we would clearly state where we stand, we would lay our cards on the table and indicate to the United States the risk it runs if it pursues a policy of exporting unemployment. The government has preferred not to go in that direction. It feels that is too tough a course to follow. Some day the government may have to follow this course, because it does not have enough money to bribe United States industry to behave and to provide employment in Canada; but for the moment the government is not prepared to do that.

Let me say a few things about the debate so far. This debate is not the end of the matter. It looks as though we will not be successful in our approach. My colleagues and I have reluctantly totalled the number of Tories and Liberals and have come to the conclusion that under the circumstances we will not be able to stop this measure. Let me say through you, Mr. Chairman, to those who may be taking some satisfaction from this situation that this is not the first time we have debated this question and it will not be the last time: the passage of this measure does not end the matter.

What has happened recently is that with the coining of a phrase, "corporate welfare bums", there has been a crystallization of the dissatisfaction existing in this country; there has been a focus directed toward this situation. Someone has referred to my leader's glittering rhetoric. I do not think this was the result of his glittering rhetoric, although he possesses great debating ability. I think it was his sense of honesty and justice that helped many people see these measures in a different light.

In this regard I should like to thank the hon. member for Northwest Territories who just bought himself a little aircraft to get around his riding. He was searching for a suitable name, and told me recently that he has found one. It is to be called "Bumair," northern division. He will be flying around his riding carrying the message of corporate welfare bums to the people.

Throughout this parliament my friends to the right in the Conservative Party have tried to make our lives a little miserable, to put it mildly. They have moved one phony motion after another. As someone once suggested, they have picked on everything except the Regina Mani-

Income Tax Act (No. 2)

festo in an attempt to get us to bring the government down on their kind of issue. We have fortunately resisted the temptation.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Max, your halo is getting so heavy your shoulders are bowing under the weight.

Mr. Saltsman: Before I sit down I should say that I believe the Conservative Party should be given the opportunity of demonstrating its determination to bring the government down and impale the NDP. We are impaled on this issue. Let the Conservative Party move an amendment that will defeat this bill, and we will support it and go for an election. We are quite prepared for an election.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Saltsman: Let us see how much you want an election and how anxious you are to find out where we stand on this issue. We shall move a motion a little later as we are not sure the Conservatives can be relied upon to bring this measure before the House a year from now. Obviously, the government does not trust us, hence its reference to 60 members. Unless there are a number of by-elections we will not be in the position in a year's time to demand a review. We intend to propose that the number be reduced to 25 members in order that we can force an examination and discussion in a year's time. In this way, such an examination will not depend on the Conservatives and we will take them out of that particular dilemma.

I appreciate the extra time I have been allowed, Mr. Chairman, and I do not intend to abuse the privilege. I want to make it very clear that my argument is not entirely against tax concessions under some circumstances, or that they do not have a useful role to play at certain times. I can imagine certain circumstances in which tax concessions in a selected way could have worthwhile results. Our argument, essentially, is that these tax measures will have no appreciable effect in stimulating employment in Canada. We believe they will do little more than bribe the United States into not taking their plants back to the United States, and that we could stop this in other ways. We feel this measure will cost the taxpayers an enormous amount of money, with very little benefit. Mr. Chairman, it is a disgrace that the only kind of policy the government can come up with is not a positive one of planning and analysis but one of bribery alone.

● (1630)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Chairman, I have carefully listened to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat telling us that Bill C-192 enabling Canadian companies to enjoy a 9 per cent tax reduction will not create a single post or job in Canada and I entirely agree with him.

However, I do not share his views on the corporate welfare bums, because the New Democratic Party financed by international unions will demand salary increases for the employees. In short, my friends of the New Democratic Party are here thanks to the corporate welfare bums, whose unions are controlling employees but we will see, once the bill is passed, whether those members