

Income Tax Act

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Don Valley spoke about corporations and their concern about spreading the tax moneys that they might save as a result of the tax decrease of 7 per cent. I would remind him of what we heard in the House yesterday about what corporations are doing with the sales tax allowance which was given on radios, television sets, and so forth. The parliamentary secretary said then that the corporations did not pass the tax allowance on to the consumer and that in fact the price on some of these articles has risen. We had the same result when we granted an excise tax allowance to drug companies—they just put it in their own pockets. I would assume that the same thing will happen to this 7 per cent tax allowance.

I am sure the hon. member for Don Valley will be impressed with the remarks of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby concerning the intellectual argument. After all, it is when you go to the heart of a man that he changes and I am sure when the hon. member recalls his experience in my riding with working men and the concern he expressed for them he does not want me to go back there and tell them that the government will give \$1.09 to a married man with three children who is earning \$4,000 a year. When he goes back to his own riding he can tell his friends there who are making \$30,000 a year that they will benefit by \$150. I am sure the hon. member for Don Valley will be persuaded to support this amendment.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question? The question is on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Amendment (Mr. Broadbent) negatived. Yeas, 13; nays, 56.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.
Clause 3 agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Clause 4 agreed to: Yeas, 53; nays, 13.

On clause 5—*Additional deduction for manpower training.*

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a speech, so everybody can relax.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, my remarks may be longer if there is interference. At the end of my previous remarks the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said he was surprised to hear that certain questions I had referred to had not been answered. After looking at the order paper, he said he could not find the questions and invited me to tell him where they were to be found. I am sorry he is not present to hear me. I have done as he suggested and I am surprised to find that all the questions

have been answered. He was quite right, and I congratulate him for the speed with which his department answered these questions. I have another question and I do not know to whom to direct it. His parliamentary secretary is not present.

Mr. Mahoney: I am here.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether the legislation, as now worded, precludes on-the-job training contracts being entered into with municipal bodies, governments or voluntary bodies as employers.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Chairman, I will convey that question to the minister and transmit the answer to the hon. member.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, I will speak for only three or four minutes. I have waited since two o'clock to raise certain questions and I am sorry the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is not here to answer questions concerning clause 5. I had hoped that he would make a four or five-minute speech on the manpower training program, which is under his jurisdiction in one sense, and that he would speak briefly about the survey on job vacancies which was tabled today in the House. We have been waiting for that survey to be tabled for several months and I think it is unfortunate that I have to raise my questions at a quarter to six on the day when we adjourn for the Christmas recess. For this reason I will keep my remarks short and direct a couple of questions to the government. I hope the minister will respond to them.

The document I hold in my hand, which is the survey regarding job vacancies, cost the Canadian taxpayer \$3.5 million. This survey, the contract for which was let by the Department of Manpower and Immigration, is a comprehensive document and indicates that there are 38,500 job vacancies in Canada today despite the fact that over 500,000 people are unemployed. There are several comments I wish to make. Firstly, these vacancies are a clear and categorical repudiation of the statement the Prime Minister made in Montreal recently. He said that if the Canadian people were to fill the job opportunities available, we would not have unemployment in Canada to the extent existing. He suggested that Canadians do not want to go to work. Mr. Chairman, this survey which has been conducted by professionals in the field indicates that there are only 38,500 job vacancies at a time when about 550,000 of our people are unemployed. I am making a "guesstimate" when I say that about 550,000 of our people are out of work on December 23, 1971. If there are 38,500 jobs available, then somewhere along the line we as Canadians have failed in our efforts to bring together those who are seeking work and job opportunities.

In Canada there are hundreds of manpower offices. We have a multimillion dollar program under the auspices of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, yet there are 38,500 jobs which are not filled. People are not aware of these jobs, or training programs are not being integrated correctly and we are not training people to fill these jobs. In the alternative, these 38,500 vacancies cannot be filled by Canadians. Perhaps Canadians are not qualified to fill them.

[Mr. Gilbert.]