

Income Tax Act

to continue on this rental basis. It will save us some money as taxpayers, and the post office is adequate for our needs."

Well, we have a bureaucracy. There is no question about that. I wrote to the Postmaster General enclosing a copy of the minutes of the council meeting in this small place and pointing out their wishes to him. I received a very nice reply from the Postmaster General, and I should like to quote one paragraph from it to show what I mean about bureaucracy.

I should explain that in communities such as this it is the responsibility of the Department of Public Works to provide us with our accommodation. It is the prerogative of that department to decide whether the accommodation will be provided by leasing or by the construction of a crown owned building and we cannot direct the action which they take.

To me it seems strange that the Postmaster General himself cannot handle such a simple request, a request which concerns his own department, but has to succumb to the rigidity of bureaucracy and turn over the request to the Department of Public Works. Not only has this government increased the degree of bureaucracy in this country, but it seems to have made it more rigid as well, coming into conflict with the recommendations of the Glasseo commission in the process.

I should like to close by reading a comment which appeared in the *Amherst Daily News* on September 18, 1963:

Mr. Walter Gordon used to warn us that unless the national budget soon moved toward balance, Canada would find itself "on the rocks".

Now, with Mr. Gordon our finance minister, hardly a day passes without a government promise of some new expenditure.

As far as I am concerned this newspaper quotation seems to sum up the situation perfectly. I have one more from the *Edmonton Journal* of September 19:

—it lies within the power of our own federal government to make two moves which would help to keep the economy moving strongly upward in 1964.

I mention the first one with my tongue in my cheek.

One is a change in the ministry of finance. The other is the introduction of economies in federal spending. The latter would give some real evidence of government determination to start reducing the deficit position.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, I should like to raise a point of order. In view of the fact that the address we have just heard was the maiden speech of the hon. gentleman, on which I congratulate him, no one on this side raised a point of order with regard to the fact that he encompassed a very broad subject matter, much broader than he would have been permitted to do even on the resolution stage. However, I would hope that the more senior members of that group would

[Mr. McCutcheon.]

not consider this a licence to follow the same broadness of subject matter at this particular time. May I also say that some three hours and three speakers ago the Leader of the Opposition solemnly undertook that we would now proceed to a point by point consideration of the various clauses in the bill, and I would hope that particular promise could now be lived up to.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what your ruling would be on this bogus point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: If points of order are to be raised in the house they should have some basis in fact. There is no point of order here at all. It is simply one member's opinion with regard to the debate, and it deserves absolutely no attention.

Mr. Macdonald: On the point of order, if there was no point of order, as the hon. member said, there was no basis for him rising and speaking.

The Chairman: Order. May I suggest that we return to the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I still have a few remarks which I would like to make in connection with the municipal development and loan board.

The legislation seems to be filled with so many inaccuracies and defects that it is my duty to take a few minutes to point out some of these irregularities.

As you know, this measure of federal assistance to municipalities is intended to relieve unemployment. According to this legislation, \$400 million will be divided among the various provinces in order to assist municipalities.

[*Text*]

Mr. Benson: On a point of order, may I raise the question as to what the municipal development and loan fund has to do with Bill No. C-95 which we are now discussing, and which comprises amendments to the Income Tax Act?

Mr. Churchill: It was mentioned by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Ricard: As my hon. friend has said, it has been mentioned by the Minister of Finance, and I see nothing but a disguised measure of closure in trying to prevent me from speaking on this matter.

Mr. Macdonald: Shame.