

S.O. 22

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

WORDING USED TO DESCRIBE CALCULATION OF EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, Section 127 (16) of the Income Tax Act, describing simply how to calculate one's employment tax credit, reads as follows:

For the purposes of subsections (9.1), (9.2) and (13) to (15), "employment tax credit" of a taxpayer at the end of a taxation year means the amount, if any, by which the aggregate of

(a) his taxpayer employment credits, determined in prescribed manner for that taxation year and any of the five immediately preceding taxation years and

(b) the aggregate of all amounts each of which is an amount required to be added in computing his employment tax credit at the end of that taxation year or at the end of any of the five immediately preceding taxation years by virtue of subsection (15)—

● (1410)

exceeds the aggregate of

(c) the aggregate of all amounts each of which is an amount deducted by him under subsection (13) in any of the five immediately preceding taxation years in respect of

(i) his taxpayer employment credits as so determined, and

(ii) amounts added to his employment tax credit by virtue of subsection (15),

for each of those taxation years, and

(d) the aggregate of all amounts each of which is an amount required to be deducted in computing his employment tax credit at the end of that taxation year or at the end of any of the five immediately preceding taxation years by virtue of subsection (14) or (15).

Sec. 127(17)

(17) "Tax otherwise payable". In this section, "tax otherwise payable" by a taxpayer under this Part means the amount that would, but for section 120.1, be the tax otherwise payable by the taxpayer under this Part.

Sec. 127.1 Refundable Investment Tax Credit

(1) Where a taxpayer (other than a person exempt from tax under section 149) files

(a) with his return of income (other than a return of income filed under subsection 70(2)—

Mr. Speaker: I regret to advise that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

INSURANCE

ST. JOHN AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION—INCREASE IN PREMIUMS

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, last week I asked the Minister of State for Finance what action she would take, along with her provincial colleagues, to curb the astronomical liability claims which are threatening the very survival of many property and casualty insurance companies. Many companies have withdrawn completely from certain liability risks. As a result, many school boards, municipalities, truck lines and others are without liability coverage.

Just this morning I learned the local St. John Ambulance Association is without liability insurance. They have never had a claim yet they have seen their premiums go from \$36,000 to \$205,000 a year. They simply cannot afford it. As a result, they have no liability insurance for their hundreds of volunteers.

Clearly the outrageous size of claims and the unaffordable rate increases are the responsibility of the provincial Governments.

I applaud this Government for its swift action to meet with various interest groups which have been so hard hit by these developments, and for taking steps to strengthen the solvency and capital base requirements of insurance companies.

However, as my colleague, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn), has pointed out, the Government should also take a leadership role in establishing a Canadian reinsurance facility. The reinsurance industry, largely located in Europe, is vacating the North American market, creating chaos of crisis proportions. The time for action is now, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEN'S AND WOMEN'S WAGES

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outrement): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the findings of a Statistics Canada survey of wages and salaries of Canadian men and women. This survey confirms what we already knew, but it is useful at times to remember that discrimination against women on the labour market is very widespread.

In Canada, men on the average earn \$3.00 more per hour than women. The survey shows that the wage differential between men and women decreases as the number of years of schooling increases. For instance, women with grade school education earn 36 per cent less than men, while women with university degrees earn 19 per cent less than their male counterparts.

The discrimination areas noted are totally unacceptable. They show that women must fight on many fronts, including employment, equality, equal salary for work of equal value, entry in non-traditional trades, and higher education for our daughters.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I would like to point out the toothless nature of Bill C-62. It will certainly not help women take their rightful place on the labour market. The Government's refusal to impose fines for non-compliance, its refusal to integrate time-tables and objectives into the Bill unfortunately show that this Conservative Government is much less concerned with women than its rhetoric would have us believe.