

Taxation Reform

duction of papers, that is, by making such a motion. It may be that hon. members do not think this procedure should be followed in the present instance, but I do not believe there is a prima facie case of privilege and the motion should not be put.

• (11:10 a.m.)

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE****INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT**

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Watson.

[English]

NATIONAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS

Eighth Report of Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works—Mr. Hopkins.

[Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

TAXATION**CHANGES IN PROPOSALS FOR REFORM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave under Standing Order 43 for the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion on a subject of urgent and pressing necessity.

At 6 p.m. yesterday the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West tabled, pursuant to Standing Order 42(2), a letter from the Minister of Finance to the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs wherein the Minister of Finance announced changes in the personal income tax rates during the first five years after the coming into effect of the tax proposals so as to neutralize some of the tax increases incorporated in the white paper proposals. Included in the statement is the following sentence on page two:

But I have said the white paper proposals are going to be changed and the changes will substantially reduce the amount available for prospective tax cuts.

Such an indefinite and confusing statement can only create uncertainty and bewilderment in the minds of the members of both parliamentary committees now hearing public tes-

[Mr. Speaker.]

timony on the government's tax proposals and in the minds of the public making representations. Why discuss proposals and changes which no longer are relevant or which may have been materially altered? A clearcut statement of the changes decided upon is called for immediately along with the reasons for the changes. The responsibility rests with the government.

I therefore move, seconded by my hon. friend from Halifax-East Hants.

That this House request the Minister of Finance to issue a concise statement with reasons for the changes decided upon in the white paper on tax changes, and that the same be communicated immediately to the parliamentary committee studying the said white paper.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West under the terms of Standing Order 43. This motion can only be put by unanimous consent. The Chair will inquire whether there is such consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity, and the motion cannot be put.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This simply discloses their closed minds.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**DRUGS****REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—POSSIBLE RESIGNATION OF CHAIRMAN**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will ensure that the interim report of the commission inquiring into the non-medical use of drugs is tabled in order to avoid forcing the resignation of the commission chairman in the middle of a very useful study? I call the attention of the Prime Minister to this statement attributed to the chairman:

Failure to table the report before the House rises at the end of June could raise such serious questions about government intentions and the utility of the commission's work that the commission would no longer have an atmosphere of sufficient confidence in which to operate.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): If the report is tabled it will certainly not be