

*Employment Support Bill*

I would like to see this question come to a vote. I do not want to preclude anyone from speaking, but in the remaining two or three minutes we could vote and the House could make a decision. If other members want to talk this out and deny democracy, they can go ahead.

**Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay):** Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague, the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), that I am much less anxious and enthusiastic in participating in this debate now than I was at five o'clock. It is always interesting, a little amusing and sometimes even sad to participate in these parliamentary games. However, sitting in the government's loyal rump as I do, I tend to view the whole procedure somewhat more objectively than perhaps other members.

This question of wanting information arises day after day. I listen to the arguments on both sides. I have never really commented on my views, but it seems that the job of the government is to make a great many difficult and complicated decisions.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I wish they would.

**Mr. Penner:** In making these decisions they need a great deal of information. If these decisions are to be wise and beneficial to the country, the information must be abundant and accurate. The government must select from that information when deciding what it is going to do about a particular matter.

Opposition members want access to the same information. However, there is a difference. They do not have to make these wide ranging decisions for the whole segment of the economy or one section of the country. They really have only one decision to make; that is, what they as a party must do to get the present administration out of power and themselves in power. The information they are constantly asking of the government is not to help them make decisions for the benefit of the country but to give them some information which they can use as political propaganda. That is their role and their game, but it is not the same game as that of the government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. It being six o'clock, the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT BILL**

MEASURE TO MITIGATE EFFECT ON CANADIAN INDUSTRY OF IMPOSITION OF FOREIGN IMPORT SURTAXES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pepin that Bill C-262, to support employment in Canada

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Saltsman (page 7633).

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening I recited a number of instances where the United States surtax would affect farm produce in Canada. In the case of meat products the heaviest weight falls on processed meat. Sausage, for example, moves from 1.625 cents a pound to 3.25 cents a pound, which is a little more than double. Cheese valued at more than 35 cents a pound moves from 12 per cent ad valorem to 22 per cent.

I do not think I need belabour the point or describe the way in which the surcharge applies to all agricultural products. According to the latest information we have, the surcharge will affect 63.5 per cent of agricultural products exported from Canada to the United States, in other words, two-thirds of our trade.

In these circumstances, those of us on this side who are discussing the proposal before the House must consider how well it is likely to deal with a situation which affects two-thirds of our agricultural exports to the U.S.A. As I said earlier, except in the processed area it will not deal with primary agricultural products. Then there is the other factor that a particular manufacturing or processing industry must export at least 20 per cent of its total production to the United States in order to qualify under this legislation. Thus, I am convinced the measure before us would leave out of its scope a great part of our agricultural production as far as the actual producer is concerned, and in my opinion it is the actual producer we should be most concerned about. I say this despite the fact that there is within my own constituency a substantial processing plant which may or may not be affected by the terms of this bill, depending upon whether or not it exports 20 per cent of its production.

I talked to the owner of a small machinery manufacturing plant in Saskatoon which is not large by Ontario standards but it was built from scratch. As far as I know the government never gave this plant any grant. It is an industry which survives by its own efforts and over the past few years has begun to develop exports to the United States; there was established a sales agency in the tier of states which are close to Canada south of Saskatchewan. I doubt that the legislation before us will affect this plant because I do not believe 20 per cent of the operation is involved in export. But it has created an industry which serves western Canada. Some of the products even come down to the east when freight rates permit.

Will the legislation before us reach this kind of entrepreneur, the family business or the small corporation which is contributing to the community in terms of capital investment, in terms of employing people and in terms of providing services and commodities? I doubt it very much. This concerns me when you can look across western Canada, you can look at Versatile in Winnipeg,