

## INCOME TAX

## INQUIRY AS TO COMPLETION OF PROCESSING OF RETURNS—SUGGESTED PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON OVERPAYMENTS

**Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the concern expressed by many taxpayers, could the minister advise the House when his department expects to complete the processing of income tax returns for the year 1972?

**Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, since the end of last month the initial bulk processing of returns has been completed. As of today, about 99 per cent of all refunds to which taxpayers are entitled have been sent out. It is normal that for some weeks hereafter there will be discussions with some taxpayers concerning their entitlement. But I think the department should be congratulated for sending out refunds faster than ever despite so many changes.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

[Later:]

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the delay in processing many income tax returns, would the minister give consideration to paying interest on overpayment of tax at the same rate as is charged by the department on underpayment of tax?

**Mr. Stanbury:** Mr. Speaker, if I were permitted by law, I would be very glad to do so. However, we do pay interest from May 1 at the rate permitted by law.

\* \* \*

## AGRICULTURE

## SUGGESTED INCREASE IN RESEARCH INTO PROTEIN PRODUCTION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Because of the high cost of protein, and in view of the fact that Canada could rectify this problem and become self-sufficient in protein production, is the minister now prepared to authorize more money for research into high-protein crops and the elimination of thioglucoside in rapeseed?

**Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we have research programs in this respect. As I said before, I believe, to some hon. member of this House, I think we are doing more in this field than any other country and plan on doing even more.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the Day.

## Immigration

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## IMMIGRATION

## MEASURE RESPECTING CERTAIN IMMIGRATION LAWS AND PROCEDURES

The House resumed, from Thursday, July 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andras that Bill C-212, respecting certain immigration laws and procedures, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon—Mr. McCleave in the chair.

● (1210)

On clause 1—*Immigration regulations, part I, s.28.*

**The Chairman:** Order, please. The discussion is on clause 1. Shall clause 1 carry?

**Mr. Baldwin:** No, Mr. Chairman; we have to continue the lesson begun last night. This is the second phase of the lesson. I am glad to be speaking with the Prime Minister temporarily in the House. It is rather interesting to note that this legislation was brought in only because the government was in difficulties. This government does not believe in legislating unless it has to. It does not believe in consulting representatives of the people unless it is *in extremis* or in a very grave situation, when they will say: We have to legislate.

I will not be any more critical of the minister because, as I said last night, he is only the most recent of a very long line of ministers who have had this problem. We are here because of the failure of the government to consult us, to secure the advice of the House, and to secure legislation. There are one or two questions which I want to ask the minister. As I pointed out last night, we have to deal with this matter because of the decisions of the Supreme Court, the Federal Court and the Immigration Appeal Board. There were several decisions.

I would like to know—I raised this question briefly last night, and the minister will have an opportunity to make a general statement about it—what the scenario is for new legislation. Are we to have from the government a green paper? Are we to have reference to a committee of the House of the problems related to immigration? Are we to take up where we left off in 1967, have a chance to examine what has transpired since and what needs to be done?

Last night, the hon. member for St. Paul's, followed by myself, dealt with the passage of the new Statutory Instruments Act. I am glad to see the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville here; he will recall that during the discussion by the select committee which considered the question of statutory instruments, one of the major concerns was the extent to which the government could alter