

Chair to indicate it cannot go as far as the hon. member would like. It does seem to me that I should base my opinion essentially on the proposition that the amendment does not oppose the principle of the bill. Hon. members will realize that the authorities indicate we are not concerned with the question of an amendment opposing the subject matter of a bill, but rather an amendment must clearly oppose the principle of a bill. This is a rather more confining situation than we would face if an amendment were required to oppose only the subject matter. An amendment must state a principle opposed to the principle of the bill rather than the subject matter thereof.

The second point I should like to make is that an amendment must stay within the four corners of a bill. On the question of relevancy it does seem to me that this amendment goes beyond the four corners of the bill. I have a great deal of sympathy for the argument presented by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. He suggested that if indeed the amendment were permitted from a procedural standpoint what we would in effect be doing in this chamber is withdrawing the bill. The debate would then revolve around suggestions and proposals as to how we could attack the problem in different ways.

For these reasons, I regretfully must indicate that in my opinion the amendment is not procedurally acceptable.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Indian Affairs—Lennox Island Reserve—construction link to mainland; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Consumer Affairs—Food price increases—assistance to people on low incomes to maintain good nutrition; the hon. member for Champlain, (Mr. Matte)—Inquiry of the Ministry.

---

## 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 by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of this 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.

24171—59

### Employment Support Bill

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the statement delivered this afternoon by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) in respect of Bill C-262 in which he detailed the contents of the bill and the consequences it may entail for Canadian manufacturers. The bill purports to sustain employment in Canada.

The minister stated that all sorts of criteria can be established: to the left, to the right, in the industrial field or any other, to the extent that the bill is so bristling with assorted criteria that it becomes impossible for the public and even for manufacturers and official economic advisers to understand it because the minister himself admitted earlier. We do not know what will be the outcome in terms of employment or maintaining employment levels.

● (5:30 p.m.)

The minister also said, we cannot foresee the outcome, we cannot anticipate on our trade with the Americans, we cannot foresee the Japanese reaction, we cannot foresee the effects on the textile industry, on the pulp and paper industry, on the plywood industry, on the clothing industry, on all kinds of domestic industries. He bluntly stated, there is no way to tell what will happen, we can only try to find a solution. He recognized that Bill C-262 offers no solution.

Sunday night, I heard the minister on CBC talking with two newspapermen, his good friend Pierre Nadeau and a fellow from *La Presse*. The minister confessed quite frankly, if we behave like good little boys, maybe Mr. Nixon will soften the burden of his 10 per cent surtax!

If we grovel at the feet of the United States government on bended knees it might be that the U.S. government will take our heed of kow-towings. That is about what the minister said on Sunday to the two reporters present. He told them: The effects of the tax will be disastrous in three months, incalculable in six months, unbearable in a year. That is what the minister said.

And just now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will be repeating exactly what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) told us this afternoon. A little later this evening, or tomorrow afternoon, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) will repeat exactly the same thing, asking us to believe that the 10 per cent surcharge applied by the United States on imports will be the cause of an increase in the number of unemployed in Canada. As if Canada did not have any unemployment before the United States took that stand:

And on Sunday night, the minister said further to the two newspapermen: It is unfortunate that this surtax should hit us at this time, because our economy was booming, things were going better, there was no more unemployment, industries were working at full capacity, when the opposite is true.

Just two days ago, General Motors at Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville, near Montreal, announced that it had