

Motions for Papers

honest, accurate and complete answers possible. That has been our attitude in this session when up to now we have already replied to 73 per cent of all questions on the order paper. So I would ask the hon. member to be more understanding and much more courteous, and not to think when we answer questions that we are trying to mislead the House. Such is definitely not our motivation. Once again, we are not here to look after the political yearnings of the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the parliamentary secretary question No. 1,295 which I placed on the order paper on February 7. It is a simple question asked of the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) regarding a program called "Open House Canada". I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary could look into the matter and find out why it is taking so long to getting around to answering it.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I also have a complaint in respect of delays in answering order paper questions. Last year on December 7 I placed question No. 895 on the other paper as follows:

Are Members of Parliament entitled to use DOT Telex "Comcen" facilities for the purpose of sending political messages to their constituency and, if so, how many members used such facilities in 1976-77—

That was six months ago. Last fall I presented evidence at a committee meeting that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) was being allowed to use DOT telex facilities to send out political—and I have to refer to it as "garbage". We are entitled to an answer as to how many Liberal members are allowed to use this DOT telex network to send out political messages. This is information that could have been provided within a week. Here we are six months later without an answer.

I realize this is a very embarrassing question to the government but, nevertheless, I am entitled to an answer. Six months is a ridiculous length of time to provide an answer to a question like that. I would like the parliamentary secretary to look into the matter and give some indication as to when I can expect to receive an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Pinard.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 6, consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien that Bill C-56, to amend the statute relating to income tax and to authorize payments related to provincial sales tax reductions, be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, when the debate ended last night, I was going to say that some people do not seem to understand the facts of the dispute between Ottawa and Quebec concerning the sales tax, a dispute which is admittedly very complex, but some do not really understand the facts of the matter or still they try to make political capital by using arguments which strike the people's imagination but have strictly nothing to do, Mr. Speaker, with the matter before us. For example, how can someone say that to give an \$85 or \$100 tax credit to Quebec taxpayers is socially unjust because the underprivileged will receive nothing?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that any one who feels he can make a useful contribution to this debate should at least know that the problem is merely to find a means to transfer to the Quebec government an amount of \$226 million to compensate the Quebec Treasury for part of the loss it incurred following the removal of the sales tax on a number of items. In short, Mr. Speaker, these tax credits granted by the federal government will be of no use whatever to those taxpayers since their tax burden will be increased by the Quebec government by an amount equal to the federal tax cut. Hence, Mr. Speaker, I find quite irresponsible a statement such as the one made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) who said in Montreal on May 28, and I quote:

We shall never agree to the Chrétien proposal. This formula is unfair because it benefits the wealthy and penalizes the poor.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, such a statement does not mean anything at all. Either the Leader of the Opposition does not know what he is talking about, in which case he should shut up, or he does, and then he should have the decency to recognize that such a statement is irrelevant. Also, Mr. Speaker, what about the argument to the effect that a tax credit of \$85 or less to Quebec taxpayers would have very little effect on the economy since the recipients tend to buy less than non-taxpayers, and thus might not inject the amounts received into the economy.

● (1552)

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, such an argument holds no water since it is a cut in the sales tax, whatever form it may take, which is supposed to stimulate the economy, and not the money given to the taxpayers by the federal government,