

limited to three days a week, giving Wednesdays to Private Members and one day to the Opposition. Therefore, if the Opposition forces the Government to limit debate on any stage of a Bill in the future, it is most difficult to agree to give statements to the Opposition.

**Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** Madam Speaker, I also believe this is an extremely urgent and important matter, but I do not think an hour given to it is in any way going to exhaust discussion.

I would like to ask a question of the House Leader. There were some discussions earlier to the effect that this item might be the subject of a full debate, that is, a debate on general disarmament, that it might take one to three days, and that there might be some arrangement among the House Leaders that certain Opposition days, and perhaps a Government day, would be given up to this particular subject. I do not know of any subject which is more important. I would ask the House Leader whether negotiations to that effect have gone on, or are they going on, or would he broach the subject to the other House Leaders?

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, this is a very interesting suggestion which can be taken into consideration. The Hon. Member raised it privately with me previously. I hope that in the near future, if the Opposition is willing to consider facilitating passage of Government legislation, we would be in a position to negotiate such an arrangement, that the Opposition would give one or two of its days and the Government would be in a position to give a day.

But I would like to make it very clear that we have to deal with some other pressing and urgent legislation, and if the Opposition continues to force the Government to limit debate on each stage of each Bill, it is not possible to talk about giving Government time for the purpose of discussing any other matters than the Bills chosen by the Government to be dealt with. If the Opposition wants to co-operate, and I believe there is room for co-operation since the subject is most important, the Government is open-minded to giving up some of its time, provided the Opposition is also disposed to give some of its time. However, we will be in a better position to assess that one or two weeks down the road when we see what happens with the two finance Bills which will be before the House.

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order and to correct the record, obviously we cannot discuss here what went on in House Leaders' meetings, but there might have been an inference that the matter was not raised at the House Leaders' meeting. I would like to point out to the House that it has now been confirmed that it was raised by the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae) with the Government House Leader.

### Order Paper Questions

[Translation]

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 3,628, 4,396, 4,550, 4,627 and 4,635.

[Text]

#### SAMPLING OF INCOME TAX RETURNS FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES

Question No. 3,628—**Mr. Blenkarn:**

1. In preparing the budget papers, did the Government examine a sample of 150,000 income tax returns and, if so, is it the Government's view that a representative sample of those earning over \$100,000 in income was 296 sample income tax returns?

2. Is it the Government's view that 40 to 50 income tax returns in those earning over \$200,000 is a representative return?

3. Is it the Government's view that, in taking 150,000 returns, it really had a proper representative sample of those earning \$100,000 and more and those earning \$200,000 and more, in view of the vast differentials between people in the larger earning brackets?

4. Of the people earning \$200,000 or more, how many in the sample consistently over the past five years earned over \$200,000 or was \$200,000 or better a single or unusual return for those persons, enabling them to take advantage of general averaging and other methods of reducing an exceptionally large earning year?

5. Over the past five years, how many persons consistently earned (a) at least \$200,000 or more a year (b) over \$100,000 a year?

6. In compiling the statistic on persons earning over \$100,000 a year, did the Government only use those persons who consistently earn over \$100,000 a year or did it include those who on a one-shot basis earned \$100,000 or better?

7. Who developed the word "tax expenditure" in the Government service?

8. Whose idea was it that income deferred or allowances made to individuals was, in fact, a tax expenditure?

9. Who prepared the tax expenditure detail on which the budget was based?

10. Is it the Government's view that a person who owns a single family house clear of mortgage is, in fact, receiving a benefit?

11. Is it the Government's view that those who have children and a spouse and the spouse declares no taxable income are receiving a taxable benefit and therefore fall within the tax expenditure theory of the Government?

12. Is it the Government's view that a capital income claimed to be a capital gain that is really only an inflationary gain is really income?

**Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of State (Finance)):** 1. In preparing the budget papers, reference was made to a data set based on detailed information transcribed from approximately 150,000 tax returns. These tax returns were selected using a stratified random sampling technique. One aspect of this type of sampling is that the rate of sampling increases with the level of income. The number of returns with incomes over \$100,000 actually included in the sample was 14 per cent of all returns filed reporting incomes over \$100,000. This may be compared to a 1 per cent sampling ratio over-all. For incomes greater than \$100,000 the 14 per cent sample represent 3,800 returns. Thus, the sample of such returns is considered adequate.