

*Income Tax*

● (1410)

[English]

**HEALTH****REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF RESIGNATION OF DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RESEARCH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to make a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. The Director General of the Health and Welfare Research Branch has resigned because of "intolerable interference" by officials within the department, outside the three level peer review process in selection of applications for grants under the National Health, Research and Development program. Since the minister has refused to meet a request that would put an end to the alleged ongoing interference with the research program, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the minister make a statement on motions explaining the reasons behind the retirement of the above-mentioned director general and whether any action has been taken to remove the difficulties that led to his resignation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 the motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**INCOME TAX****POSSIBILITY OF DEDUCTING MORTGAGE INTEREST—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

**Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

Since the government's proposed measures to deal with the housing shortage are inadequate and will not allow every Canadian to buy his own house, and considering that it is urgent and necessary to implement appropriate measures to cope with the housing problem, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That this House urge the government to allow any taxpayer to deduct from his personal income tax the mortgage interest paid on his house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such a consent.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent, the motion therefore cannot be put.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[English]

**HOUSE OF COMMONS****PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM NEW BRUNSWICK LEGISLATURE**

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before beginning oral question period, I know that all hon. members would want me to call to their attention the presence in the gallery of a very distinguished delegation in the form of some members of the Special Committee on Procedures of the New Brunswick legislature led by their very distinguished Speaker, the Hon. William J. Woodroffe.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**ANTI-INFLATION BOARD****REQUEST FOR APPEAL PROCEDURE WHICH WOULD NOT NECESSITATE INDICATION OF UNWILLINGNESS TO COMPLY WITH BOARD ORDER**

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister arising out of the assurance he gave yesterday that he would increase his understanding of the appeal procedures in connection with any operation of the Anti-Inflation Board. In view of the fact that appeal from a decision or ruling of the board is available only to those who either defy or threaten not to comply with a ruling of the board, can the Prime Minister assure us that he is looking into this problem personally and that a defined appeal procedure will be set up which is direct, which does not require a party to an agreement or dispute to put himself in the position of actual defiance of the law and criminal behaviour?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, reflecting on the economy of the legislation as passed by this House, the way I see it is that the administrator is in reality the person who applies the law with all its teeth and force. The Anti-Inflation Board is the body which is enjoining, counselling, admonishing, advising, or jawboning. They have no power to impose any penalty or any binding order. Therefore, it seems perfectly normal to me that when the Anti-Inflation Board has issued its directives, completed its enjoining, its jawboning, and so on, the parties or party should then decide whether or not to listen to the admonition. If the party does not listen, the matter is dealt with in a quasi-judicial way by the administrator who has effective law enforcing powers. It is at that stage where the parties are more than counselled. It is at that stage where the parties are obligated, under the law, to follow a certain course of action; and, therefore, it is at that stage, properly, that an appeal should lie, and an appeal in effect does lie. Frankly, I cannot see the worry of the Leader of the Opposition about this being against the spirit of the legislation and justice as we practise it in Canada.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I must say, it is an extraordinary misfortune for Canada