

tion. I am grateful to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre for bringing that citation to my attention because it is, of course, entirely relevant. I must say it is very difficult to find a way around the citation. It seems to me that it is clear. It states:

The House cannot, under the guise of referring the subject matter to a committee, refer also certain provisions of the bill itself.

The hon. member has drawn attention to the fact that we would not be referring provisions of the bill, and I agree with him on this point. The proposed amendment contains the words "so that consideration can be given... to the position of agriculture, fisheries and small business under the proposed legislation." This is going beyond the reference of a subject matter. It is an instruction to consider certain provisions of the bill, which can only be done after the bill has been read the second time and referred to a committee. It seems to me we would be opening the door very wide to this kind of amendment if we were to depart from the well established form, that is, a motion to refer the subject matter of a bill.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has indicated, it is the intention of the mover of the amendment that certain matters be considered by the committee. I would hope the hon. member for Waterloo would find it acceptable to put a period after the words "Trade and Economic Affairs". With the consent of the House the amendment would then be modified along those lines so that it would read as follows:

That Bill C-262 be not now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Saltsman: That would be agreeable to me.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): May I intervene, Mr. Speaker? I would have suggested to Your Honour that it was not possible to use that particular language in the amendment because it would amount to mere tautology. The motion before us is that the bill be read a second time and go to the committee for consideration. Now we have a motion that the bill be not read a second time, yet still the subject matter must go to the same committee.

An hon. Member: But not the bill.

Mr. Speaker: That is a point I have in my mind, but I believe there is a difference between referring the subject matter and referring the bill itself. The very point of this type of amendment is that instead of referring a certain bill, use is made of a system we have devised over the years, a system which provides for the referral of the subject matter of a bill. If this amendment were carried, the subject matter would go to a committee, there would be a report from that committee and eventually the bill itself would come back to the House with the reference.

The difference is slight, I appreciate, but at the same time I believe the form of the amendment is the correct one, therefore the Chair has to accept it and put it to the House, which is what I have done.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): The bill before us, entitled "an act to support employment in

Employment Support Bill

Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect" is, of course, a response to the action recently taken by the United States, introducing a surtax directed against not only manufactured products and other products made in this country but against similar products made by trading nations throughout the world.

I would say at the outset that the worst kind of speech anyone could make in this Parliament today would be a speech which would lead its hearers to conclude that the man making it was feeding like a political leech on the adversities of the present government. I intend to avoid that pitfall. Nevertheless, I want to emphasize at this point, as I shall again at the end of my address, that the government cannot conceal its economic bungling by endeavouring to blame the United States of America for the unhappy economic situation which exists today and which existed before President Nixon announced that the time had come for a new United States economic policy directed against unemployment, inflation and international speculation. I have listened to the debate so far, particularly to the speeches made by hon. members to my left who seem to blame the United States for our present difficulties. But I have not heard any really constructive proposals from them. The suggestion has been made before by me that if the Europeans can form a common market to promote and protect the trading interests of Europe, then maybe it is time to organize an American common market composed of Canada, the United States, Mexico and some of the countries of South America. Possibly an agreement could be worked out along these lines.

I do not intend to hurl reproaches and incriminations at the United States for what has been done. Nevertheless, I do wish to say a few words about the facts as they are today and add one or two positive suggestions as my contribution to the debate.

On August 15, 1971, President Nixon inaugurated a series of economic reforms which will affect not only the United States but all the industrialized nations whose economies are linked with the United States, or who trade extensively with the United States, Canada in particular. Even before this date the Canadian economic situation was such as to produce high unemployment, stagnation having set in as a result of the bungling economic policies followed by the government. It is interesting, I believe, to read what the *Gazette* had to say about the situation existing prior to the imposition of the surtax. That situation will, of course, be aggravated by the effects of the surtax, and, in addition, it will be made worse by any rise in the value of the Canadian dollar as compared with the United States dollar in terms of purchasing power. This is what the *Gazette* had to say, and the *Gazette* has not always been unfriendly to hon. members opposite.

Despite massive spending on social programs, poverty remains as intractable a problem as ever; it cannot be otherwise, of course, when both costs and the wages of unionized workers are rising at a faster rate than government payments to individuals possibly can.