

*Inquiries of the Ministry***LABOUR RELATIONS****QUEBEC—LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE—POSSIBILITY OF ARBITRATION**

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour in order to clarify the contents of the telegrams to which he referred. Have the parties to the Montreal dock strike indicated their willingness to go to arbitration, pursuant to the terms of the contract? Have they actually said they are prepared to do so?

Hon. Martin P. O'Connell (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am glad of an opportunity to clarify the answer I gave earlier to the hon. member for Shefford. In the reply of one party there is clearly an indication to proceed to arbitration. In the reply of the other party I would put it this way: there is an indication of not being unwilling to see an arbitration procedure pursued by the other party.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would remind hon. members that there are just one or two minutes left before the end of the question period. The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. Alexander: I have one supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer of the minister and the fact that this strike is costing the country \$100,000 per day, can the minister advise the House when he figures the government should step in, in view of the fact that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest the hon. member is asking an academic question which I would judge not to be in order. The hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

* * *

TAXATION**INQUIRY AS TO REASON FOR DELAY IN MAKING INCOME TAX REFUNDS**

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. On June 2 the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador inquired about the long delay being experienced in processing income tax returns. Is the minister now in a position to reply to that question?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Yes, I am, Mr. speaker. The answer is rather lengthy because it is somewhat detailed. I sent the hon. member a letter this afternoon setting out the information. I would be pleased to have the letter printed in *Hansard* or dealt with in a way satisfactory to the House, if the hon. member wants the answer to be given publicly.

[Later:]

Mr. Dinsdale: In view of the statement of the minister, I wonder whether he would agree to having the letter printed in *Hansard* today so that it might be available to all members of the House? It is a matter of general interest to all Canadians.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Speaker: The Chair would suggest that the letter be tabled rather than have that kind of correspondence appended to *Hansard*. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

FAMILY INCOME SECURITY PLAN**COMPLETION OF CONSIDERATION OF BILL BEFORE ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE—TIME REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT PAYMENTS**

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of National Health and Welfare tell the House if the government proposes to proceed with the FISP bill before the adjournment of the present session, has there been any review of the timetable for the bill to become operative? I am thinking of the statement made the other night by his deputy minister to the effect that it would be eight months before payments could be made under the new plan.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): As to the first part of the question, it is generally the position of the government that we will complete our deliberations on the bill. As to the second part of the question, the reasons were given in the committee for the time interval before actual implementation and were well set out by the deputy minister. They have a good deal to do, of course, with the administrative difficulty in terms of sending out the applications, obtaining the returns and processing them through the computer.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES**SPECIAL AGENCY TO CO-ORDINATE USE OF COMPUTERS AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS**

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a correction, in effect, to *Hansard* of yesterday in respect of an answer to a question by the hon. member for Wellington, recorded at page 2888 of *Hansard*, about the co-ordination of computers within the government. He asked under whose jurisdiction is the agency responsible. There are two agencies in fact or two bodies. The Department of Supply and Services has a computer service bureau which provides a general computer service to other government departments, but responsibility for co-ordination and development of the total framework of computer use is with the Treasury Board.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day. Perhaps I should put to the House first the motion referred to earlier by the President of the Privy Council. My understanding is that this motion is to be put without debate.