

hensive in scope as those in the white paper, or may we expect tax legislation that is much narrower in scope?

Mr. Benson: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I did not say what my friend indicated at all. I would be glad to send him a transcript of what I did say. I have also been sending him copies of my speeches over past years, which I trust he has read. I indicated following my statement last night that we would have comprehensive tax reform and that it would be introduced—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Finance has made his white paper disappear, does he intend to follow it?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—ASSESSMENT OF VIEWS
OF PEOPLE

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the unrepresentative nature of the submissions that were made to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs regarding the white paper, most of them having come from business and organized industry, can the minister say to what extent he has assessed the views of ordinary people in Canada in terms of reaching a decision on the white paper?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, during the past 18 months or so I have spoken to a great many ordinary people in Canada, unlike the Leader of the Opposition. I am also taking into consideration their views, not just the interests of Bay Street as represented by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, may I say it is music to the gambler's ears to hear the suckers roar. I address my supplementary to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement last night by the Minister of Finance that he does not intend to introduce his white paper on tax reform as legislation, may we expect in the future that the government will accept the opposition's views and suggestions in other important fields as well?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, now that we also have the St. James Street view as well as the Bay Street view, I would simply like to say that in this whole exercise—

Mr. Hees: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will recognize the hon. member on a point of order. The House is in a very cheerful mood today, but perhaps we should be allowed to go on to another subject in a moment after we have heard the hon. member's point of order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that my supplementary question was addressed to the Prime Minister, and I am not aware that the Minister of Finance has assumed that portfolio yet.

Mr. Bell: We want Gordon back.

* * *

ENERGY

POSSIBLE MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—STATEMENT RESPECTING PROVISION OF RIGHT OF WAY—DEVELOPMENT BY FOREIGN CAPITAL

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister arising out of the speech made yesterday by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in Dallas, Texas. In his speech the minister stated that if it was desirable to build a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay through Canada to the United States the right of way through Canada would be made available. In view of the fact that twice within the last few weeks ministers of the Crown have offered this route, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether the Canadian government is now indicating its willingness to provide a right of way through Canada despite the fact that, according to the minister's own statement in the House, studies of the ecological effects of such a route have not yet been completed?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Monsieur le Président—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members know the rule about statements made outside the House. The hon. member quite properly asked the question of the Prime Minister, and perhaps in the first instance, at least, a reply might be made by the Prime Minister. If questions are asked directly about the matter, these could be addressed to the minister thereafter.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not had the benefit of reading the speech which the minister made—

Mr. Hees: Take my advice; don't bother.

Mr. Trudeau:—and I would hesitate to comment on it on the basis of the no doubt very brief, if not distorted, summary by the leader of the New Democratic Party. Therefore I cannot comment on the speech. That is why I suggest that perhaps the minister might be given the opportunity of saying that what he was quoted as having said was not so.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary question, and this is no more distorted than my previous statement.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas: It was an actual quotation from a transcript of the minister's speech which I have in my hand.