

Railway Act

having no regulations at all. The bill, we frankly admit, is a short term solution being brought in now so that a long run solution and policy can be presented to this House.

Mr. Orlikow: Before he finishes, will the minister permit a question? When the 50 studies to which the minister referred are completed, will they be tabled and made available to members of this House and to the public, or will they be treated as so many other studies commissioned by the government have been, as internal documents not to be made available to the public?

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, it is my policy and the policy of my department to table, as we did in the case of the post office, as many of these studies as we possibly can. The restrictions will of course be those that are imposed by the authors, restrictions that may be applied for reasons best known to themselves and may be designed to prevent personal criticism or criticism of, let us say, a particular aspect of an operation. For instance, the criticism might not serve the interests of the Canadian people because it might contribute in a material way to some decrease in morale within a department. But I would say that, generally speaking, the answer is that we intend to table as many of these studies as we can, if not all.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being five o'clock, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch)—housing—urban renewal, Vancouver—request for policy statement; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—social security—inquiry as to establishment of income floor; the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. MacRae)—veterans affairs—transfer of veterans hospital.

The House will now proceed to consideration of private members business as listed on today's order paper, namely: notices of motions.

[Mr. Kierans.]

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

INCOME TAX

SUGGESTED INCREASED EXEMPTION FOR OLD AGE PENSIONERS

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give immediate consideration to increasing the Income Tax exemption of all citizens from the date they start receiving their pension from \$1,500 to \$2,500, retroactive to January 1, 1969 in view of the spiralling cost of living during the past ten years, so as to prevent the tax burden from falling heavily on those no longer able to earn.

He said: The motion before us which I have had the honour to move is in effect a plea on behalf of all citizens in receipt of old age security pension to have their income tax exemption increased from the present \$1,000 to \$2,500, retroactive to January 1, 1969.

I am naturally pleased that this resolution is No. 1 on the order paper under private members' notices of motions and I express the hope that, knowing there could hardly be a dissenting voice to the implementation of this measure in this first session of the twenty eighth parliament, the government will give it early consideration. This motion is, of course, principally designed to offer a modest relief to pensioners in general and to super-annuates, most of whom have been suffering from the inflationary trend of consumers' prices prevailing in the economy.

Last Friday the government unveiled a tax reform program which will free some 750,000 low income Canadians; among this number there will be many of those whom this motion is designed to help. Nevertheless, the exemption for a single pensioner does not reach the \$2,500 I am suggesting in this resolution.

In the white paper the Minister of Finance has acknowledged the need for an increase in tax exemption from \$1,000 to \$1,400 for a single person, but does not make any distinction between a young person in the prime of his productivity and a pensioner, a person who has reached the declining years and can only look forward to a bleak future. For what the minister has suggested in the overhauling of the tax system, I have nothing but praise. The general effect is bound to be good; but it would have been a little better if he had taken into consideration the plight of those for whom I am speaking.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The purpose of this motion, however, is not to discuss the merits of the white paper on