

*Business of Supply*

In my opinion, it would not have been possible to find a better way than this non-confidence motion to waste the time of the house.

We know that the government and the minister are aware that there is much to do in the manpower field. They try by all possible means to improve conditions. They recognize that conditions are not perfect, but they are endeavouring to improve them.

We are the first to deplore those conditions and we wish that instead of always condemning the government hon. members opposite would sometimes make positive and specific suggestions and not merely put forward programs which would entail further expenditures.

It must also be recognized that when the government is compelled to raise taxes to find the necessary funds to carry out certain projects suggested by the hon. members opposite, the latter are the first to criticize and condemn it.

This is why members of the opposition should once in a while, put in good suggestions and realize that if they ever came to power, they would be facing the same problems.

[English]

**Mr. Broadbent:** Was the hon. member not in the house when I moved the amendment and, if so, did he not hear the arguments I put forward and the proposals I offered?

**Mr. Loiselle:** Yes, and I will deal later with some of the points made by the hon. member. I was asserting that some hon. members who continually criticize and push the government into undertaking more responsibilities in different fields are the first to protest when it is necessary for the administration to raise money by way of taxes to cover the additional expenditures incurred. As I say, I will answer some of the questions raised in the hon. member's speech later on.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Would the hon. member not agree that I tried to make it clear in my speech that we were not opposed to new taxation, that we were very much in favour of implementing certain sections of the Carter Report which would result in certain tax increases for some sections of the population? That was one part of the argument. We are in favour of a selective increase in taxes in certain areas.

[Mr. Loiselle.]

• (9:20 p.m.)

The other argument was that it does not necessarily involve an increase in expenditure but rather a shifting of emphasis from the private to the public sector.

**Mr. Loiselle:** Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use up my time by giving a lengthy reply to a speech. The hon. member had his time this afternoon. However, in answer to what he said I should like to see whether the government does bring forward new ways of raising taxes in other fields. What then will be the stand of the hon. member's party in this house? We will have to wait and see.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on with my comments if the honourable members allow me to. I have been very good and I let them babble all afternoon against the government and the department. I should like to continue my speech and explain what the government is doing and what it intends to do in that field.

I said a moment ago that we did not think the situation was ideal; fortunately, we do not think either that it is hopeless. I could tell the honourable member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) who claimed just now that the government was not looking after the problem of employment for young people that the department is investigating every year on employment possibilities for university students, and so forth.

Now, the investigation conducted by the department for this year is not yet completed; however it shows that more jobs than in past years will be available to graduates in engineering, business and business administration and science. That is concrete evidence that the department has taken steps in that direction and the facts are consistent with the publicity made by the department and the work performed by our officials, as I was saying a while ago.

From July 1968 to September 1968, the department engaged in an advertising campaign which—directly or indirectly it is hard to say—provided 13,000 jobs for students. This was achieved thanks to the work done by the officials of the Department of Manpower, within its 250 or 300 offices in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I travelled outside the province on departmental business. I spoke with the officials of our Manpower office in the locality where I happened to be