

*Income Tax Act, 1986*

trying to engage in a nice game of smoke and mirrors. They are trying somehow to create the impression so as to make people believe that this is a good measure. The plain fact of the matter is that this is a bad measure. It will be one for which the Tory back-benchers will be asked to account when their turn comes in the next election.

● (1130)

**Mr. McDermid:** Could I ask one short question, Mr. Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse) rose in his seat prior to the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid).

**Mr. Stackhouse:** I was going to make a comment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is time for a short question by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Hon. Member for a clarification, if I might. From what he said I understand that the Liberal Party would support the \$500,000 capital gains tax exemption if it were to pertain entirely to gains within the borders of Canada. Is that what the Hon. Member said this morning?

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to elucidate the point for the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) who is famous for catching things halfway but not fully.

**Mr. McDermid:** You are famous for presenting them that way.

**Mr. Caccia:** What I said is that if the measure were of such a nature as to focus on creating economic growth and jobs in Canada, then we would look at the matter probably in a supportive manner. I cannot speak for my Party's critic, but having read his speeches I believe there are grounds to believe that the matter would be looked at in a positive light.

The fact is that this measure is diffused to any form of capital gains anywhere in the world, which does not generate economic benefits to the Canadian economy. Therefore, we are not moving in the right direction. I went on to say that this measure flies in the face of the Government's declared determination to reduce the deficit. One does not reduce the deficit by providing a \$500,000 capital gains tax exemption in 1985, or any other year for that matter.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret to advise Hon. Member that the time allotted for questions and comments has now expired. The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Parry) on debate.

**Mr. Caccia:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. John Parry (Kenora-Rainy River):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the applause of the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), even though it might have been intended for one of his colleagues.

**Mr. Penner:** I will give you some applause, too. We expect a good speech now.

**Mr. Parry:** Mr. Speaker, in examining Bill C-84, which is before us today for its last day of debate at third reading stage, I would like to take a few moments to go back and recount a little of the process which has brought us to where we are today. I think that by any objective analysis or measure it is a process which is seriously flawed, a process that is deserving of much more attention by this House and by this Government than it has apparently been given.

Of course, traditionally, the Bill is a large one, and this year's Bill is no exception. After all, the Bill consists of amendments with respect to the Income Tax Act and related statutes, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Financial Administration Act, and the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax Act. The list of titles should give Hon. Members one initial clue, at least, as to the complexity of the task which is being undertaken. It should also give us some clue to enable us to ask questions as to why the process should be so complicated and so lengthy.

The Bill includes 235 pages of revisions to the Income Tax Act and related statutes. I believe that the time which should have been given to the examination of a Bill of this size in committee was completely out of proportion with the very niggardly amount of time which was eventually allowed to the committee. The belief that Members of Parliament can knowledgeable and with a full mastery and understanding of the topic and the facts review and, if necessary, revise a measure of length and complexity in one week of committee hearings flies in the face not only of common sense but of parliamentary tradition and everything for which that tradition stands.

There were witnesses who would have been happy to appear before the committee and who were not asked to appear even though they offered to do so. There were witnesses who, frankly, were just not allocated enough time to expound on their points of view. We had a process which saw minimal participation from members of the Government. With the 210 Members which is at its disposal many of the committee hearings proceeded with only one or two government Members, more than the combined members of the Opposition. The Canadian Bankers' Association asked to appear before these hearings but was not invited. On a complex Bill such as this we were given only one week of hearings. The committee meetings were hurried, with little advance notice of the meetings being given.

I would like to contrast that very compacted, intense and demanding schedule with the schedule the Government followed between the presentation of its Economic Statement in May and the tabling of this Bill in November. After all, that represents a period of approximately six months. At committee we were assured by the Assistant Deputy Minister that his