

employees. I suppose the king of kings, in response to this kind of measure in recent weeks, is Inco. It is a case unto itself, a veritable monstrosity demonstrating the genius of the economic policies of this government. So far Inco has made \$93 million profit this year, and in the past decade it made \$1.7 billion. The previous minister of finance announced \$75 million in assistance to Inco through the Expert Development Corporation. This will provide jobs—but in Indonesia and Guatemala, not in Canada. When they had to announce some shutdowns, they said the government of Indonesia would not put up with it but the Canadian government would, so they would lay off Canadians.

A month ago the Minister of Finance, with a flower in his buttonhole, stepped into the House and announced on that fateful day that the government would reintroduce the bill we are now debating which would give Inco another \$10 million. The very day the government announced the \$10 million additional gift to Inco to create jobs, Inco was having a press conference in downtown Toronto to announce the lay-off of some 4,000 Canadians in Ontario and Manitoba. Nothing could demonstrate economic stupidity in more vivid terms than that announcement.

We oppose this package of proposals because, at a time when we have over one million unemployed, they are the wrong policies at the wrong time. Jobs will not be created in Canada, at a time when demand is slack, by giving corporations the capacity to expand even further. We should increase demand. That means tax concessions, and all of this money should be going to the consumers of Canada.

[Translation]

● (1612)

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to repeat what the two previous speakers of the opposition have said on this motion of closure as a motion of closure is ever unpopular because usually the government always imposes it when it has an unpopular law to pass. This Bill C-11 amending the Income Tax Act is clearly incomplete. When we go through our ridings we see that people do not take the government seriously on this act. What does a tax cut of \$100 a year mean? A tax break of \$2 a week, and that makes people laugh and turns them against the government and this bill. People realize that the government is not thinking about them but others.

So I think the government instead of applying its motion of closure today could have waited a few more days and allowed the members of this House to continue to make suggestions and propose amendments, and the government should be considering those suggestions from the opposition and put to a vote the amendments introduced by the opposition because the truth does not lie only on the side of the majority. It can also come from the other side of the House. It was said that this is a bill of about 1,000 pages and one-inch thick containing many words but little substance.

Mr. Speaker, this bill amending the Income Tax Act contains many tax breaks for big businesses seemingly to allow

them to create jobs but there is nothing in this bill to help small and medium-size businesses. There is nothing of substance. The government does not even want to define what a small business is. The government does not know at present. I asked the Minister of State in charge of small business (Mr. Abbott) if he could define what a small business is. His answer to me was: no, he had not gone that far yet. There are projects, studies, but nothing concrete, nothing ready.

Mr. Speaker, I think bills like Bill C-11 could go much further. They should not be limited to proposals such as those which were made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) the other day, namely an additional \$150 million through government programs to create temporary jobs, jobs that are going to disappear after a few months.

Mr. Speaker, we realize that all these temporary job creation programs are not what is needed, that they do not meet the objectives of Parliament to fight against the employment crisis that has been going on for too long.

The government proposes programs to fight against unemployment and create jobs, but each time we realize that this is useless and that unemployment still increases. The same holds true for inflation. Every time the government suggests programs to fight inflation, the rate of inflation goes up, to such a point that I am tempted to ask the government to stop fighting against these problems because the more it fights, the worse the problems get. The government should change its programs and accept the proposals of opposition parties and existing agencies, such as the Canadian chambers of commerce and small or medium business associations, which make really valid suggestions. The government should agree to consider those proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that instead of bringing in closure like it has done today and like it always does for unpopular bills, the government should be patient for a few more days and allow not only opposition members, but also government members to offer suggestions so that the opposition members can learn what suggestions government members have to make.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am against the use of Standing Order 75C, which should be used only in extreme situations, since in my opinion, Bill C-11 certainly does not represent at this time an extreme situation.

[English]

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to speak long in this debate. I rise to support Standing Order 75C and the five hours further debate that will be allowed in this House as a result of it. This parliament is based on Westminster, the mother of parliaments, yet we have not modernized to any degree whatsoever our monstrously inept rules to deal with the lightning-quick world in which we live.

It is evident to me that the opposition House leader finds it necessary to represent the great electors of Ottawa-Carleton day after day with histrionic delaying tactics. I have no intention of using this time allocation to further his woolly-