

I want to say something general about this legislation. I do not know whether anything can be done about it because it is really too long and too complex. I do not know why the draftsmen had to produce pages and pages in order to set out the principles. I would very much hope that someone could say to these draftsmen, "Shorten this. Cut out the verbiage that is unnecessary." Perhaps it is an impossible thing to do in this case.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The hon. member is a classic common lawyer.

**Mr. Brewin:** I may be a common lawyer but I am also a common man and I do not like long, complicated words that no normal person would ever want to read or could understand if they did read them.

**Mr. Otto:** You would not like to be paid by the word.

**Mr. Brewin:** There is one example of what I am saying. There are provisions for what I call forced negotiations. When your property has been expropriated after receipt of notice, the confirmation and offers having been made, you may have to engage in a process of mediation or settlement. The mediator is appointed by the government. I suspect that this process is a waste of time. I do not mind negotiating directly with the government, and I do not want to instal a whole host of fifth wheels on the coaches whereby you would waste time going through other processes. If I cannot agree with the government, I want to go to the courts as quickly as possible without going through unnecessary proceedings which are more expensive and less satisfactory. Delay and uncertainty in this field causes more frustration than actual injustice.

I am afraid I will not use the 40 minutes that are assigned to me, but I do not suppose anyone in the House will complain very bitterly about that. I may be setting a good example to others who may follow in the debate. May I say in summary that this is a good act. It is at least 50 years overdue. It has some excellent features which we welcome. It has in it some provisions which we question and which we desire to have clarified. There are some things in it which we oppose and want taken out. I assure the minister that in the committee he will have our full co-operation in trying to make the act as modern, just and up-to-date as possible. As I said in my opening remarks, this is a subject which we

### *Expropriation*

may regard as academic and suitable for discussion by lawyers, but when the shoe pinches it pinches the average citizen and we are concerned with justice to individuals in this country.

Therefore, I commend the bill and say to the minister that we hope to meet him again in the committee. At that time we shall press amendments which we think will constitute real improvements to the bill.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank hon. members for the instructive and positive way in which they dealt with the bill. I wonder whether with the consent of the House I could call it three o'clock?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being three o'clock I do now leave the chair until 5.45 p.m.

### SITTING SUSPENDED

At 2.40 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended until 5.45 p.m.

### SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 5.45 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### TAXATION

#### TABLING OF WHITE PAPER ON TAX REFORM

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I now table the white paper on proposals for tax reform, according to the provisions of Standing Order 41 (2).

### HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin):

That the House be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.