

## RESEARCH

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN TO RESEARCH COUNCILS—  
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the chairmen appointed to two research councils, the Humanities Research Council and the Natural Science and Engineering Council, have been individuals drawn from the bureaucracy and give the appearance, at least, of being partisan political appointments, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald):

That the government explain on motions why it has not heeded the advice of the research community in appointing researchers to these positions, and that when the Medical Research Council chairman is appointed, it be an individual drawn from the research community.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for the presentation of such a motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

## STATUS OF WOMEN

## PENSION EQUALITY FOR WOMEN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, and seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), I move:

That this House calls on the government, now that it has heard again from the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, to expedite the introduction of legislation to establish equality for women, and that as a step toward this goal special emphasis be placed on pension equality, including full rights for homemakers under the Canada Pension Plan, equal pension rights for all women between the ages of 60 and 65 regardless of marital status, increasing the pensions paid to widows under various government plans to at least 75 per cent, and the continuing payment of pensions granted to widows regardless of any subsequent change in marital status.

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion for debate, pursuant to the Standing Order, would require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## Oral Questions

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

## TAX CUTS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1978

**Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance: I have given him notice of its general thrust. The question touches on the \$3 billion tax stimulant which the minister has maintained was put in place as of January 1. Last Friday, when I asked him to explain to the House the form of this \$3 billion tax stimulant, he was only able to indicate \$700 million of what would be regarded as a tax cut effective January 1 this year. Having received notice, will the minister now indicate exactly where the \$3 billion is expected to be?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the measures that were included in Bill C-11 at the end of December last were the stimulants to which I was referring. Indexation, which came into effect on January 1, accounted for \$850 million. Then \$730 million represented the \$100 given to the seven million taxpayers for the first two months. Also, \$100 million was the amount of credit for the creation of jobs—the bill was passed and became effective in February—and there was the \$1.6 billion which was approved under Bill C-11, voted at the end of December. That is a package of \$3.2 billion.

● (1417)

**Mr. Stevens:** A further question to the minister, based on the answer he has given. He referred to \$850 million as a tax cut, but in fact it relates simply to the indexing of personal income tax. Would the hon. gentleman tell us whether it is not correct that \$1.5 billion of what he claimed to be a tax cut effective on January 1 of this year did, in fact, become effective as long ago as January 1 or March 31 of last year? If he agrees with that proposition, why does he consistently maintain he must wait still longer to find out the effect of these measures?

**Mr. Chrétien:** I think that, technically, the hon. member is right when he says indexation was provided for previously in the law. One of the problems of indexation is that it amounts to a reduction in the amount of income tax people have to pay, but people do not realize this because it comes into play as a result of previous legislation. We are the only nation which has adopted such a system, and whenever there is a cut like that it means people have that much more money than in the previous year. It is only fair that a minister of finance should remind them of this. It is only fair we should repeat it, because the House voted in favour of this system continuing on an automatic basis. We have to tell the people that we have it, because in the United States they do not have that cut. We have it on an automatic basis; that is why I have to repeat it all the time.

**Mr. Stevens:** Since it is now established that the \$3 billion to which the Minister of Finance was referring includes tax