

that it will be many years before any federal standards in the other important areas of water use will have any practical effect.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### TAXATION—WHITE PAPER ON REFORM— CHANGES SUGGESTED BY VICE-CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, the reason that I appear on this "late show" to speak on the subject of the white paper is a very sensible one, I think, in that many of us in this House are trying to smoke out or find out from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) exactly where he intends to go with this document. My speech will not be directed toward the content or the merits of the document but rather to finding out from the minister—who is not in the House or even behind the curtain—what course he proposes to follow with the white paper. At least to most of us the white paper would appear to be the most important single program to be laid before us in this session of the twenty-eighth Parliament. So, motivated by these purest of principles, the other day I asked the minister this question as recorded at page 7121 of *Hansard*:

● (10:00 p.m.)

In view of the comments on the white paper made by the vice-chairman of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, will the minister say whether we can anticipate that the far-ranging changes recommended by the vice-chairman will receive consideration by the government?

To which the Minister of Finance replied:

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations made by the committee as a whole, consisting of members of all parties, will be considered seriously by the government.

So we all stand up and say "whoopie" to that, "Hear, hear," "Jolly good fellow" and all that sort of stuff. But the fact is that because I am one of these mild fellows, pleasant in nature and so on, I can ask a question and get one kind of response from the Minister of Finance but the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), who has a somewhat different disposition from myself—much more effective, but a somewhat different disposition—asked a question a few days

22375—38½

### Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

before that and received an entirely different tenor in the answer that was given to him.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert was asking about the deferred savings plans of companies like Simpsons-Sears. The way the Minister of Finance replied to me was honey, but the way he replied to the right hon. member for Prince Albert was waspish. I do not think you bring about changes in this country by being nice to the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants and being acerbic to the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

**An hon. Member:** It should be the other way around.

**Mr. McCleave:** My hon. friend has pointed out that it should be the other way around, but granted the merits of that, Mr. Speaker, I am almost being sidetracked by that kind of thing. The point I am trying to make is a very serious one. I received about 700 representations on the question of the deferred profits savings plan and I know that other members from constituencies in which there is a Simpsons-Sears, or the like, have received a similar amount of mail.

On the question of what one could expect by attending conventions, some 99 per cent of the 800-odd briefs presented to the Finance Committee expressed views. Therefore, I boil the long preamble down to this, that Members of Parliament who have a limited amount of time and are really trying their best to deal with the very serious topic of tax reform—I think every member of the House espouses tax reform but wishes it would apply in proper measure—have to consider several questions. The first is that after we have received a fair amount of evidence, should the Finance Committee of this House be hearing the same points made over and over again, ad nauseam? Or should there not come a point when the Minister of Finance acknowledges that this point has been well and truly made, that he and his advisers had not considered it when they drew up the white paper, and therefore it is something that should be withdrawn, or he should make a statement on it?

Second, Mr. Speaker—I am coming to the last 30 seconds of what I would like to say—is it not time that the Minister of Finance, in view of all these opinions we have now had expressed before the Committee on Finance and all of the things that we were bombarded with, said there are certain areas where he thinks the original white paper is wrong, that he is withdrawing them and that he will re-