

*Adjournment Debate*

amendment or some suggestions as to how we might solve the problem of the person who has to work 35 hours to 40 hours a week to get his farm going and who wants to be a farmer, who needs help, and who really has some legitimate grievances, then I would suggest that an amendment be made to Section 31. They should deal with that particular problem—

**Mr. Wenman:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that it would be appropriate as a matter of order for you to inform the House, as you did by recognizing me as a speaker, thereby taking my rightful place from me on the floor of the House, that if in fact the Member of the Liberal Party continues to speak he will effectively kill this measure which will help the small farmer of Canada. Mr. Speaker, will you inform the Member that he will do that?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae).

**Mr. McRae:** Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the last manoeuvre at all. I am trying to suggest that if there was an honest attempt on the part of the Opposition to seriously come to grips with the problem of the small farmer who is trying to get a start, who wants to spend the rest of his life on a farm, and who wants to pass it on to his son or daughter, that that kind of suggestion would receive support from this side. We are trying to do that very thing.

That is not what this particular motion proposes. It proposes to repeal Section 31 of the Income Tax Act. Repeal, as far as I am concerned, means to take it right out of the Act. That means that anyone could use the purchase of a farm as a loss against income. It means that someone else will have an opportunity to get away with beating the tax system and have an added tax expenditure. That particular person will not pay his fair share. My constituents who work at Great Lakes Paper or Canada Car, in the riding of Thunder Bay-Atikokan and across this land, will have to pay more.

There was a Budget a couple of years ago—which may have had some flaws—which the Opposition Party ran into the ground. The whole point of that Budget was to bring more equity into the tax system to ensure that every Canadian would pay a fair share, and there would not be people with incomes of \$200,000 or \$300,000 a year paying no tax at all.

If the Party opposite comes into power—and I hope that they do not—in the next six months, we will have changes. That is what it has been about for the last six months: tearing the tax Department down. We will have changes which will mean that all kinds of Canadians will not be paying taxes. The working man, the guy who earns a wage, is the guy who will have to pay more.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

● (1800)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

METRIC CONVERSION—ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS—  
MINISTER'S STATEMENT. (B) SALARIES OF METRIC COMMISSION  
EXECUTIVES

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I refer back to some questions and answers which took place in the House of Commons on May 24. I asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) to explain her recent news release communique which clearly states that because of pressures brought to bear on the Government of Canada by various organizations such as the Consumers' Association of Canada, the Retail Council of Canada and other industry representatives, it was made very clear to her that she was going to have to reintroduce certain regulations affecting the implementation of metric in Canada. It was my concern that there was a recent court decision in the Province of Ontario which clearly exonerated retailers in that Province against charges that they were using Imperial against the law.

It was the decision of Judge William Ross that both Mr. Halpert and Mr. Christiansen should be permitted in the Province of Ontario to continue the use of Imperial and metric, or either measurement in their retail establishments. I wanted to know how the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs could reintroduce regulations making it illegal to use Imperial measurement in any form, in any retail establishment in the Province of Ontario, when she, as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, back on November 2, on page 28620 of *Hansard* said, and I quote:

At the moment, of course, the law prevails and we will not be able to enforce any of those regulations in the Province of Ontario.

The Minister later extended that to include all of Canada. I asked how then could the Minister, in her communique on May 14, reintroduce amending regulations under the Weights and Measures Act which would make certain forms of measurement illegal in Canada? Her answer to me, I believe, corrects the problem, that is that she is not talking about the use of Imperial weigh scales. To use her exact words which are found in *Hansard* of May 24, 1984, at page 4010, I quote:

In fact there were 242 member organizations at a metric forum that requested we put regulations in effect that would call for both metric and imperial advertising:—

She goes on to say, and this is the key:

—advertising only. It does not refer to any use of metric scales.

That clearly means now that the Minister has decided that Imperial scales are now legal in retail grocery establishments. That means that it will not be against the law to weight in pounds with the use of Imperial weigh scales, or use metric weigh scales. The only regulation which the Minister is bring-