

Income Tax Act

progressive than the mere provision that the income will be taxable once it has been received by the individual.

● (2120)

Mr. Bussières: Mr. Chairman, of course we could debate at length on how to apply such an incentive to change the volume and pattern of our energy consumption. However, in the program put forward by the government we have decided to offer grants on an individual basis and, as I said earlier, to ensure a greater equity in the use of that money by making it taxable as part of a person's taxable income. This is a choice which we made, and certainly this measure will be widely used in Canada. It will benefit all Canadians, while helping us implement our energy conservation program aimed at attaining self-sufficiency within the chosen time frame.

Mr. Rae: I do not want to lengthen the discussion, but I would like to suggest to the minister that for this year we will wait and see whether the program is adequate as far as implementing the energy conservation program referred to by the minister. Next year we will be anxious to get the figures to see whether the \$800 taxable grant is indeed adequate for the implementation of the National Energy Program. We will want to look at the figures, and I must tell the minister that if he is genuinely sincere—and, of course, I know he is personally sincere—if the government is sincere with respect to self-sufficiency, they will have to do more than that to truly ensure that Canadians will conserve more energy.

Mr. Bussières: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I too am convinced that as a society we should do much more in that area of energy conservation, if we are to reach self-sufficiency. But I believe we should rely not only on government incentives but also on the awareness of Canadians to the need to conserve energy, if we are to attain self-sufficiency, and as well on their sense of responsibility and their commitment to reach the goal of self-sufficiency, in order to complement the various energy conservation measures included in the National Energy Program. Therefore, I feel that these incentives, combined with the efforts of each and every one, will allow us to achieve our goals.

[English]

Clauses 25 and 26 agreed to.

On Clause 27—

Mr. Axworthy moved:

That subclause 27(6) of Bill C-54 be amended

- (a) by striking out line 10 on page 57 and substituting the following therefor:

“the taxpayer, the person with whom he was not dealing at arm's length or the predecessor corpo-”;
- (b) by striking out line 39 on page 57 and substituting the following therefor:

“the taxpayer, the person with whom he was not dealing at arm's length or the predecessor corpo-”;
- (c) by striking out line 18 on page 58 and substituting the following therefor:

“the taxpayer, the person with whom he was not dealing at arm's length or the predecessor corpo-”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 27, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 28 agreed to.

On Clause 29—

Mr. Axworthy moved:

That subclause 29(4) of Bill C-54 be amended

- (a) by striking out line 25 on page 63 and substituting the following therefor:

“for the year,”; and

- (b) by striking out lines 30 to 41 on page 63 and substituting the following therefor:

“is a refund of premiums (within the meaning of section 146) under a Registered Retirement Savings Plan received by the taxpayer out of or under the plan on or after the death of the person who was, immediately before his death, the annuitant thereunder and the taxpayer's spouse, and

(iii) was not deducted in computing the taxpayer's income for a previous year;”

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 29, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 39 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 40—

Mr. Axworthy moved:

That Subclause 40(2) of Bill C-54 be amended by striking out line 5 on page 100 and substituting the following therefor:

“(2), where a person has trans-”

Mr. Rae: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to indicate to the minister one of the concerns of my party and myself about the remarks of the Minister of National Health and Welfare in her speech on January 19 regarding the proposal that a spouse be paid a salary from an unincorporated business and have that payment deducted as a business expense. Also the proposal allows Canada Pension Plan contributions on behalf of the spouse. I want to raise a couple of questions about this, one of which I raised with the Minister of Finance some time ago. Perhaps tonight the minister can shed some light on this problem.

The other question was raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in her remarks when she indicated that this provision allows the government to say it has fulfilled its commitment to include women in the Canada Pension Plan. I want to indicate to the minister that this covers only a handful of women; it does not cover those who cannot afford the Canada Pension Plan contributions. While we are supportive of this amendment which was, after all, proposed in the Crosbie budget, we do not regard it in any sense as an excuse for the government to claim that it is resolving the problem of pensions for women who work at home.

We are just touching the surface of this problem. We have made progress, and for many people and unincorporated small businesses it is a significant advance. Still, it is a very small step for mankind, if I may say so, and not one which can be regarded as an achievement. I found it ironic that the Minister of National Health and Welfare would take a proposal from the Crosbie budget and somehow claim that it was partially implementing the promises of the Liberal Party in the last