said: "I certainly will consider as always the remarks made by my good friend, the hon. member for Gatineau". The amendment put forward today enables the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance to consider those requests which are genuine given the expenses people incur to travel.

It is also said in the amendment that all costs incurred for public transportation in main centres could be deducted. There are young people in Montreal who have to commute by train or by bus and who spend tens of dollars every week and when I say tens of dollars, that is not much. By the end of the year, over 50 weeks, it means $500 just to go to work. Coming back to the argument which was often raised, namely, the costs incurred by a doctor who is going to work or who must go see his patients, these costs are deductible. It is true he is not travelling very frequently these days but anyway, these costs are deductible.

When the parliamentary secretary indicated earlier that we should not give this opportunity to those who have large cars, this is precisely what the government is doing now. Doctors and professionals driving big cars, even if they shortened the Cadillac, are the ones who drive around in Cadillacs while the worker has to buy a Toyota or some other American or European compact car to make both ends meet. At the same time, the same government allows the price of gas to go up in an area such as the northwestern part of Quebec where gas is as high as $1.10 a gallon; once again this hits the small worker who must travel 15, 20, 25 miles every day to go to work. All that because of bad government administration.

So what we are asking for today—and I think it is quite logical—is to give for once a chance to the worker, to reduce this increase in expenses, this reduction in salary, because when you spend $20 a week on gas, repairs on your car, whether you like it or not, this results in a direct reduction of your salary.

In concluding, I will say that unemployment insurance penalizes those who cannot accept work 20 or 25 miles from home because this is not profitable to them, because in many cases what would the guy earn staying at home? He would earn $140 a week staying at home. If he goes to work for $140, plus $20 or $25 of travelling expenses, then he reduces his salary and because he refuses the UIC penalizes him, when the other guy in spite of all is willing to go and work even for that reduced salary. This amendment is intended precisely to bring relief to those people who pay, who are willing to go to work. Some professionals go to work knowing that their expenses are deductible but the worker still goes to work knowing that his expenses are not deductible. That is precisely the adjustment sought in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard).

● (1652)

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on this amendment which, I think, is very important. Some of my colleagues on this side of the House expressed their intention to support this amendment. I think they are only seeking the justice that we have always wanted for workers in general. The parliamentary secretary to the minister will certainly reflect on the remarks made regarding this justice required for workers.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

I am not one of those wishing that the minister reconsiders the benefits granted to businessmen as it might often be difficult to compare businessmen's responsibilities with those of workers. It is certainly not difficult to feel responsible concerning the needs of workers. I think we must give them a minimum of benefits. Obviously for those who must go to work outside, it is not always a matter of choice. Of course you will tell me that they should find a job close to home. We know very well that it is not always easy to find a job in one's own community these days.

So I think we should give some benefits on that respect to those who succeed in finding a job. And again when we talk about $400 I do not think it is excessive as we know perfectly well that in some cases their travel and employment expenses largely exceed $400.

I think that the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) pointed out that this measure would encourage those who often would prefer drawing unemployment insurance rather than accept a $150 job when they know full well that they will lose money if they accept it. God knows if we have problems! The industry and businessmen have problems with unemployment insurance. However, we recognize their usefulness. We also recognize that they cause many difficulties to those looking for employees. Today, through an amendment which is commendable and which we shall support without hesitation, we are trying to offer a compensation that would be, at the same time, a work incentive.

I could perhaps ask: What about when the officials of the minister, for instance, must travel on official business, and I imagine they often have to do so. They probably have such advantages or tax deductions. In view of the present circumstances, why should the workers not be entitled to those same advantages? I hope that our friends opposite understand the importance of this. I think it is important to note that it was judged appropriate for members of parliament to be entitled to deduct certain expenses in view of their obligations. In my opinion, it would be difficult to justify our position to the workers if we refused this deduction of $400 when I am convinced that everyone is well aware of the deductions allowed in the case of members of this House, which are certainly quite justified. How then could we refuse to support this amendment which, in my opinion, corresponds—

Mr. Breau: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would allow a question.

Mr. La Salle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if it is an intelligent question.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the arrogance of the hon. member who suggests that my question could perhaps not be an intelligent one, I would like to ask him if he could, intelligently, explain to the House how this amendment would be an incentive to work because, in fact, I cannot understand how increasing a deduction from $250 to $400 can be a