

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): How do you know, if you are not aware?

Mr. MacEachen: To my knowledge, there has been no consistent rejection of proposals because no such proposals have come forward in the House of Commons or elsewhere. The hon. member has made some general comments about the necessity of taking action in this field, and I have listened to his comments, but at no time have we rejected any specific proposal. I have told the hon. member and the House that the matter is obviously of considerable interest to all hon. members of the House and to the government, and is presently under study and consideration.

Mr. Rae: Madam Speaker, the minister's lips are moving, but the words are not coming out. He cannot have been in the same House of Commons or in the same finance committee that I was in, and members of my party have been in, discussing the Bank Act and asking questions. I simply say to the minister that I take the trouble to read his speeches. I suggest that he take the trouble to read some of ours on this side, because we have made some very specific proposals.

REASONS FOR LOW TAX RATES

Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood): My supplementary question has to do with advertisements which have been taken out by the Canadian chartered banks which have blessed us with them over the past week or two, telling us what a good job they are doing and how their profits are reasonable. I wonder if the minister would consider having the federal government take out some advertisements on our banking system, to tell Canadians exactly how much tax the chartered banks have been paying over the last ten years, why it is that their rates are so absurdly low, and how those rates of taxation compare to the rates of tax which are paid by the average Canadian.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): The hon. member's suggestion probably merits consideration, but it has been our experience that when we have taken out advertisements to explain government policy and government approaches, it has been vigorously opposed by both parties, the official opposition and—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: —the New Democratic Party as well. The hon. member is not really making very much of an impression on a Monday morning.

Some hon. Members: Monday afternoon!

Oral Questions

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO DEBATE FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the government House leader. Today in *The Globe and Mail* the hon. member for Edmonton South, the foreign affairs critic for the official opposition, is quoted as criticizing the government for not making House time available for a debate on foreign affairs. Considering the work on the part of all parties in this House on the question of North-South, and in view of the July summit in Ottawa, would the House leader ask the two opposition parties to give up one of their allotted days so that the government could also allot one as well, and thus we could have a three-day foreign affairs debate before July in this House?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, this issue is admittedly most important. The government is therefore still willing to follow the suggestion made by the hon. member. However, if three days are too much for the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche), the Progressive Conservative party might consider using one of its many allotted days this month to debate this very important issue of the North-South dialogue or international affairs in general instead of seeking a formula for poison pills or injections to assassinate criminals in Canada.

* * *

[English]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

WASTE DISPOSAL SITES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. The minister is well aware of the South Cayuga waste disposal site in southern Ontario, a site which was not recommended by the MacLaren report and which was not subject to an environmental study or environmental hearing. It just happened to be land owned by the province of Ontario, dangerously situated between Lake Erie and the Grand River. In reply to my request to the minister to involve the federal environment ministry in order to protect the waterways of Canada and the health of the people of Haldimand-Norfolk, I was informed that toxic waste disposal is a provincial matter and that the federal government would not involve itself, even in this situation of national waterways, contrary to its action in the Niagara River.

● (1440)

Now, Madam Speaker, we receive a news release stating that Environment Canada is co-operating—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member please put the question.