

## S.O. 43

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

● (1412)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There is a phrase in the motion which troubles me in terms of order. I will not delay the proceedings too long, but I suggest the words "without debate" must be deleted from the motion, for obviously any motion is debatable and simply because the language is there in the motion cannot render it otherwise. Therefore, the motion by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), would be:

That this House acknowledges May 3, 1978, as "Sun" day, thereby encouraging the utilization of solar energy technologies so as to provide humanity with an abundant, economical, safe and environmentally compatible energy supply.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

\* \* \*

## HOUSING

## CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the announcement regarding a new direction in housing by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, and in light of the fact that the federal minister proceeded without consultation with the provinces, without which the program cannot work, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway):

That the Minister of State for Urban Affairs convene a meeting immediately with all provincial ministers responsible for housing in order to reach agreement on the federal minister's new programs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. According to Standing Order 43, the presentation of such a motion for discussion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

## MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

## REQUEST FOR INCREASED GRANTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I wish to move the following motion, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House calls on the government to increase the grants to the Medical Research Council so that medical schools will not find it necessary to eliminate ongoing research projects and to dismiss medical research and support staffs because the grants for the fiscal year 1978-79 will not permit either the

[Mr. Speaker.]

continuation of presently ongoing projects or provide for the beginning of necessary new research projects.

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion for debate can only be done with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

## WORK HOURS FOR GRAIN ELEVATOR EMPLOYEES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and national importance. As negotiations between the grain handlers' union and the Manitoba and Saskatchewan wheat pools have gone nine months with a Department of Labour conciliator, without being any nearer solution, and as wages are not at issue, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski):

That the Minister of Labour exempt permanently from hours of work regulations country elevator managers so that the issue may be settled without destruction of the competitive position of the Manitoba and Saskatchewan wheat pools or disruption of the country elevator grain handling system.

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion for debate, pursuant to Standing Order 43, can only be done at this time with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

## DISPARITY BETWEEN INCOME TAX PAID BY U.S. AND CANADIAN WORKERS

**Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many international chartered accountant firms are drawing attention to the fact that substantial tax equalization is required when United States employees are transferred by their employers to Canada—in some cases resulting in a person requiring \$28,996 in Canada to give him the same after-tax, take-home pay he would have in the United States with an income of \$19,700—will the Minister of Finance indicate if he is aware of this imbalance between Canadian and United States taxes; and, if so, does he intend to suggest