

side of the House have commented that \$80 is not sufficient to do the job. I think if hon. members understand how this \$80 million is going to be spent they will realize that it can do the job. This money is going to be put into the economy because it is necessary to restore the balance or margin between cost and return. Although it is not necessary to pay the whole of the cost of any jobs that might be lost, it is essential to pay part of the cost. This is why with \$80 million it is possible to produce a great deal more in terms of wealth and employment as a result of our proposed program.

Let me give the House an example of what I mean. A company employing 500 workers has exports to the United States worth \$14 million, which comprises four-fifths of its total output. The surcharge raises the tariff on those exports to the United States from 11 per cent to 21 per cent. This company is in a highly competitive business so the surcharge cannot be passed on. Neither can it take a profit squeeze because, as hon. members know, most Canadian companies have already had a profit squeeze and they are unable to borrow any more money. As a result, this company might have to lay off its 500 workers. All 500 employees would lose their jobs, not to mention other jobs lost among this company's suppliers.

Under the terms of this bill, if this company fulfilled the requirements it would be entitled to a grant amounting to two-thirds of the surcharge on its United States exports, which over a six-month period would cost approximately \$500,000. So in this particular instance the government would have to pay the company \$500,000 to maintain 500 jobs, which works out to \$1,000 per job over that same period. So hon. members see the relationship there.

While this may not be an example that could be followed through in all instances, it does illustrate how the \$80 million can be spread out and made to apply to a great many jobs in Canada. We think it will make a difference so far as the number of jobs that might be lost in Canada is concerned. It is reasonable to assume that the proposed amount of \$80 million will save a major proportion of the estimated jobs which would otherwise be lost. As I have pointed out, this is a specific program designed to do a specific job. If you try to read into it that it is a bill to cure all kinds of other ills in Canada, you are mistaken. I commend it to you only as a bill which will do this job well.

● (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Bell: Would the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): As the hon. member knows, he can only ask a question if the hon. parliamentary secretary is willing to answer it.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Yes, I accept it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bell: Since the hon. member endorsed and praised the speech of the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans), and since three cabinet ministers thumped their

Employment Support Bill

desks and appeared to approve what he said, can we now expect the hon. member and other members of the cabinet to bring forward changes in the tax proposals to create the situation about which the hon. member for Duvernay spoke? Is the government now ready to make the changes he advocates and as a result of which the hon. member for Duvernay resigned from the cabinet?

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression we were discussing Bill C-262. The hon. member has asked a question concerning the tax bill. I would suggest his question is out of order. As I mentioned before, the points raised by the hon. member for Duvernay were very interesting. We have many diverse opinions on this side and I am sure the government will study his views very carefully, as will all members on this side.

[Translation]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in speaking on Bill C-262.

A lot has been written and said in the past few days about this bill but I have yet to see tonight government members or cabinet ministers come up with adequate solutions to this serious problem we are having with the Americans.

Mr. Speaker, that is definitely a problem, and that situation, intended by the Americans, is putting Canadians in a predicament. In view of those facts, we must react, express our opinions, and particularly try to find true solutions.

The present problem is actually an economic problem and not a political one. It is a problem resulting from the circumstances of the economic evolution. But every problem has a solution.

That goes to prove more and more that we are dependent on foreign countries, particularly the United States. A country dependent on other countries does not really look after its own affairs, does not solve its problems, and leaves it to others to control its economy, when it should do it itself.

Since we depend upon the Americans, there has been some carelessness. I do not want to blame anybody, but surely there must be someone who is responsible. The people responsible are not only the members of this government, but also members of previous governments who never did assume their real responsibilities in order to bring about economic independence.

This is where the problem lies. Since the resumption of the session, we have heard members of the four political parties. The party in power has introduced a bill containing provisions which to a certain extent have merit, but they are not likely to solve the problem once and for all.

Now we are asked to provide \$80 million to Canadians or an independent board which will be established to deal with this problem. All opposition members are saying that this amount is inadequate, that it is just a drop in the bucket and that it will not solve anything.

I do not feel that these \$80 million will solve the problem. Even a billion would not do it either. These \$80