

Mr. FRASER: I never said there was anything wrong with the bill but in cases where someone thinks there is it could be remedied and you would be quite willing to check up on it.

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): I can give an unreserved assurance to the committee just as with the Income Tax Act and the Excise Tax Act these taxing measures will be under constant review and if there is any need indicate of amendment we will be bringing forward amendments year by year.

Mr. FRASER: I think all the people want is the assurance that it will be checked into whenever needed.

Mr. BENEDICKSON: I think that is far from satisfactory. I think one of the chief objections is that you are moving so fast with double meetings scheduled for today and tomorrow, you will find the work of this committee has proceeded so fast that the public is I think going to complain, and these organizations which are interested are naturally going to complain two or three days from now when they realize this committee has started this work. The first publicity that was given was in Saturday's press. It was during the week end. I have had some inquiries today about the bill in regard to what is to be done with it. You will find in the next day or two that will develop. I think it is a most improper procedure to rush through a parliamentary committee and hold two meetings a day on a bill of this importance and have our work finished by the time it would normally develop that organizations would express a desire to come forward and say something about the new bill which they have only had before them a day or two for the purpose of study.

Mr. FLEMING (*Eglinton*): I am sorry that Mr. Benidickson was not here on Friday so this matter could have been dealt with at that time. I am sorry he did not hear my reference at that time, a reminder of the position that Mr. Abbott took with respect to the income tax bill when he brought it forward some ten years ago. I am following the procedure he followed and urged on the committee at that time that they should sit intensively in order to have the benefit of continuity of discussion. While there were some grumblings then in having to sit intensively—and I think they were in the banking and commerce committee—I believe they realized it was a sound procedure. In this way they were not starting here and dropping it and coming back a couple of days later and going over the same ground again.

The advantage of sitting twice a day is threefold. In the first place there will be continuity in a bill that has to be followed to be properly understood. One does not go away and come back a couple of days later and pick up the thread on a new clause. Secondly, we have to consider the officials, and I have mentioned Dr. Eaton. He is attending the committee at my personal request. He is here just by the day and he has his own practice. I just have not any right to ask him to keep on coming back, meeting after meeting and week after week. In the third place I think the idea that was approved on Friday by the committee is going to help the committee over the difficulty of having so many committees sitting at the same time. That is a matter of common complaint and the idea was if we concentrated on this and got on with it that members would be spared the conflicts that arise in attending so many committees which are sitting at the same time if the committee meetings are to be confined as under normal circumstances to say, Tuesday and Thursday.

I want to say this also in regard to the time schedule. I emphasized on Friday that we are here with the officials to offer the fullest information and to answer all questions so that the committee may have unimpeded opportunity of going thoroughly into the bill. As to the time schedule with respect to the session I have to remind the committee that this bill still has to go to the Senate and will be reviewed in a committee there. We cannot assume this is like some other financial bill which the Senate does not review in detail, like