

ation to extending the deadline from midnight tonight until some time in the future to allow the backlog of tax returns to be filed in a proper manner?

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I reviewed that situation with my officials this morning. I am now in a position to announce to the House that the tax filing deadline for all taxpayers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan will be extended from midnight tonight to next Monday, May 7.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

TABLING OF LEGISLATION TO REMOVE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. On International Women's Day the Prime Minister's office announced with great fanfare that the Government would repeal Section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act, which would remove discrimination against women. There are only 36 days left before the summer break. Did the Prime Minister mean what he promised and, if so, when will he table the legislation to remove this discrimination against women?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes. As to timing, we are attempting to have that legislation moved forward in parallel with the legislation on self-government for natives. We would hope that the House would be prepared to deal with both expeditiously.

POSITION OF MINISTER

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister responsible for the status of women. Recently the Minister threatened to resign if no action was taken on this matter of repealing Section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act. I understand from the Prime Minister's statement that the self-government legislation and the equality legislation might be tabled at the same time. Does she agree with that, or does she support the view of Canadian women that the discrimination in that Act must be removed first?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately my resignation is not imminent, I must say to the Hon. Member, because the Prime Minister, as he indicated a moment ago, has said that the legislation will go. The words I used at the time the press picked up the remark were that the legislation had to go and, if it did not go, I would go. Unfortunately they could not plan on my going because the legislation was being amended.

Yes, I feel that that must come first. When the Prime Minister indicated that the legislation was coming forward as

a package, he did not say that it would be one neat package but that they would be coming in together. Certainly the amendments to the Indian Act will be separate.

Oral Questions

* * *

AGRICULTURE

POTATO INDUSTRY IN ATLANTIC CANADA

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that of the Hon. Member for Kindersly-Lloydminster, and it is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. He has explained the reasons why there was no payment in the west. Could he tell us why the application for price stabilization for the potato industry of Atlantic Canada has been on his desk for about a year and a half and there has been no reply from him? Will he be giving that reply before he makes any major leadership campaign in New Brunswick?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows full well that there is an eastern district that you make payments on, and a western district. If you follow the policy, there is no payment on the 90 per cent of the five-year average in western Canada. If you use eastern Canada, there is no payment either. I am sure the Hon. Member knows that it is so small that it would not be worth the effort to go and pay it. If you are just going to use it for New Brunswick, there would be a payment. If you were going to use it for Prince Edward Island, Quebec or Ontario, there would be no payment. The other provinces are saying that they do not want any payment.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression when I participated in the passing of the legislation for price stabilization that there was a point of income which triggered a payment for price stabilization for virtually any commodity in Canada. Certainly the application which relates to the 1982-83 crop was on the basis of sales which would trigger it by a formula that could be applied to the Act as far as New Brunswick is concerned.

MINISTER'S DISCRETIONARY POWER

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, why has the Minister not used his discretionary power which gives him the opportunity to relate cost of production and return on crop as well as the individual five-year average for that crop? If he uses that return on the particular crop, it is triggered very generously.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not know from where the Hon. Member is getting his figures, or what formula he is using. The formula for Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island is such that it does not trigger a payment using the five-year average and a 90 per cent payout. If I were going to go to 95 per cent or 100 per cent, there probably would be.