

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

answer to the question which I ask in order to satisfy my own curiosity. As a matter of fact, I do not even see him here tonight. His parliamentary secretary is in attendance in a fresh, pink shirt—

**An hon. Member:** It is red.

**Mr. McCleave:** He is here in a fresh, red shirt, and since this is a good colour I am emboldened to press on with the question that brought me here this evening. Earlier in the day, during the question period, I asked the Minister of Finance whether he intended to proceed with tax reform on the basis of a budget or on the basis of a separate bill. He was able to pick his way through that question like nobody's business, because really I should not have asked it in that form. I should have asked a longer and much more complicated question. Anyway, I will give him the benefit of his answer which was that if it is carried out in a budget, it will involve a separate bill anyway. This is quite true. But, Sir, I wanted to ask a brief question without bringing everybody back tonight. I did not want this huge crowd around me tonight. All I was asking was how he was going to do it.

The country is also asking the question, the group that has been floating full-page advertisements in the newspapers of this country. They have been asking how the Minister of Finance will proceed with his tax reform. Will he have the same crowd—I think that is the expression—that wrote the original white paper? Is that crowd going to be doing it again, will it be another crowd or will the Minister of Finance descend from the heights of Olympus to do it? All I was trying to find out was how and when it will all happen. Perhaps it is unreasonable to ask such deep and fundamental questions at this hour, but this was what I was trying to discover earlier in the day, and nothing came back.

However, seeing the parliamentary secretary here, an old friend of us all, and knowing he will take our question seriously, we can rest assured that we will be told when this tax reformation will take place.

**Mr. Bell:** Don't count too much on it.

**Mr. McCleave:** The hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) is a friend of mine, but we know he is somewhat cynical. I expect we will hear the whole thing unfolded. Anyway, I will give the parliamentary secretary the chance to do so.

**Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance on numerous occasions has indicated his intention to introduce the legislation implementing the tax reform in April. I would refer the hon. member to the minister's most recent statement in the House in this regard, made in response to an inquiry by the hon. member's leader last Wednesday as recorded at page 3031 of *Hansard*. The minister stated:

I expect to introduce legislation for tax reform some time toward the end of April.

The question was not, as the hon. member appeared to believe during the oral question period today, whether or

[Mr. McCleave.]

not tax reform will be introduced by a separate bill or by a budget speech. Evidently the hon. member has had an opportunity to get that matter straightened out since the question period. A bill amending the Income Tax Act will be introduced in any event. The only question is whether the introduction of that bill will be preceded or accompanied by a budget speech. It is not possible at this time to indicate which of the procedural options will be followed.

#### HOUSING—SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF MUNICIPAL LAND BANK

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the attendance here of the minister in charge of housing. He is one of the hardest working members of the House and I will be very happy when he becomes a full minister and receives the full pay that he so richly deserves.

• (10:10 p.m.)

On January 29 I asked the minister in charge of housing a question with reference to an article which appeared in the *Toronto Telegram*, written by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) in which he stated that the Canadian housing situation is bad and is getting worse. He said that the government missed an excellent opportunity in the setting up of a municipal land bank and providing all the necessary moneys so that the cost of housing, especially the cost of land, would be sharply reduced. Mr. Speaker said that my question was in the form of a submission and that he assumed the minister would consider it as such.

If I can give you a little history concerning this matter, Mr. Speaker, I will go back to 1967 and the Dominion-Provincial Conference on Housing. The then Prime Minister set forth the problem in very clear and concise terms. He issued a press release and on page 1 this passage appeared:

The broad facts and forecasts about urban growth are well known to all of us.

Almost three quarters of our population now live in cities and towns.

By 1980 nearly two-thirds of all Canadians will live in 29 major urban communities; one-third will live in Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver.

At least 500,000 acres of new land, including much of our best farmland, will be needed to accommodate the physical expansion of these 29 urban centres by 1980; three or four times that much if we don't make more efficient use of land in the future.

On page 11 there were these words:

It is true that housing costs have increased by about 50 per cent between 1951 and 1966.

This is more than for most other costs and must cause concern—

Land costs, however, will be an increasingly significant and disturbing factor in housing costs, unless appropriate action is taken to reduce or at least limit further increases.

On page 15 the then Prime Minister was reported as saying the federal government was going to attack the problem on four main bases. I shall quote two which he considered to be part of the answer:

Federal financial participation in comprehensive planning of our urban regions and in the advance acquisition of land for