

Income Tax Act

because we want a sound system of taxation in this country”.

But there continued the distortion of the intent and purpose of this government. A coast to coast gallop spread confusion wherever he went saying, “I will defend this country against what they are trying to ram through”. Suddenly, the scenario was changed because the Minister of Finance, true to his words, invited submissions from every part of the land. The government received 211 submissions along with 1,093 other representations and innumerable letters from members of the government and a few from the opposition as well. The committee held 146 meetings, the committee reported, recommended changes and amendments were proposed and many accepted. Then there has been more debate on the resultant bill before us.

Despite this unparalleled democratic process, charges are made of muzzling free speech in some of the badly-informed editorials in the newspapers and by the shrill voice of dissent from the other side of the House. These accusations are simply preposterous. Some of the opposition members are men of real ability who must be embarrassed to have to give voice to such charges on the advice of some of the public relations men of the Conservative party.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): We heard this nonsense in the pipeline debate.

Mr. Perrault: They know that at some point governments must govern and at some point debates must be brought to a conclusion. Mr. Speaker, this is what I mean—and I am not going to quote from speeches made by former or present members of this government or great Liberals of the past; I am going to quote the spokesmen for the official opposition. The hon. Davie Fulton, who was a distinguished Minister of Justice in this House for many years, appeared at the Couchiching Conference in 1964 representing the Conservative Party, and he said:

But no matter what mathematical disposition has been arrived at by the voters, Parliament has the duty to get on with the business of the country; and the government has the right and responsibility to govern, so long as it enjoys the confidence of Parliament, or at any rate unless and until Parliament accepts the responsibility of defeating it—

He went on to say:

Having been provided first with an improved system of transacting the business of the House and the country, and second with the means and the opportunity to do their jobs more effectively, members can then accept as the framework within which to operate the disciplines and self-restraints inherent in the following—

• (8:50 p.m.)

I again emphasize that it was the official spokesman for the official opposition who said:

An important restraint which members should impose upon themselves is to accept as a matter of routine an “allocation of time” system as it operates in the United Kingdom Parliament, by which representatives of each party meet in advance to decide how many days will be spent on each major matter of government legislation. In the unusual circumstance where it is not possible to obtain agreement, the government itself takes responsibility for—and there is a note upon—a motion for allocation of time on the matter in question.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert, speaking in this House on July 21, 1960, as recorded at page 6672 of *Hansard*, said:

[Mr. Perrault.]

I see no reason why that debate should not be reduced so far as the number of days is concerned. Immediately, I suggest that the opposition will say that they are being throttled.

That was said by the former leader of the Conservative party. In a great speech, he went on to say:

I am not taking the United Kingdom Parliament as an example for our Parliament, but it is the mother of Parliaments, and I am going to refer to some of the things which could be done. I think there is no reason why that debate should not be reduced so far as the number of days is concerned.

Mr. Nesbitt: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am extremely sorry to interrupt the hon. member. It is my impression we are discussing third reading of the tax bill and are not engaged in debate on the closure motion moved this afternoon. It is not relevant.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that an effort must be made by hon. members to make speeches which from near and far refer to the amendment before the House. I appreciate the point made by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). He is quite right; what we are debating now is third reading of this bill. I must say that having listened to the debate on third reading I have a suspicion that a number of members on both sides of the House have strayed from time to time from either the amendment before the House or the general principle of the bill.

I agree with the hon. member that an effort should be made by hon. members not to revive the debate which took place during the two hours which preceded the vote on the motion under Standing Order 75C. There is no point in further discussing this issue. We should make an effort to concentrate on the bill which is before us on third reading and, more particularly, the amendments which are before us from time to time.

Mr. Perrault: With Your Honour's indulgence, may I point out to the House that last night the House leader of the official opposition spoke purportedly on third reading, but he spoke entirely on the subject of closure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Perrault: Earlier in this debate there were frequent references to closure and the alleged attempt of this government to restrict free discussion.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Perrault: I am not willing to remain silent when these kinds of charges are bandied about as is being done frequently in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Perrault: I suggest, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Alexander: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do not mean to interrupt the hon. member. I want to be exact with my submissions. It is my understanding that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has a motion before the House. Listening to members opposite, I am surprised that it has not been touched on at all this evening. With due respect to all hon.