

*Income Tax*

legislation is too complex and that the amount of time for consideration is inadequate. There is no doubt but that the amendments are voluminous. There is no doubt but that they are difficult to understand. However, as I have already indicated, the amendments have been examined by Members of Parliament, they have been examined by Senators in committee, and they have been extensively examined by the public for the last 16 months.

Since the introduction of the Bill on December 7, 1982 this House has heard over 99 Hon. Members speaking during second reading stage alone.

**Mr. Smith:** Filibuster! Shame!

**Mr. Cosgrove:** We are now moving to third stage consideration of the Bill. At second stage there were 99 Hon. Members of this House who spoke on the legislation.

**Mr. Malone:** How many for the Liberal Party?

**Mr. Cosgrove:** Seventy-four of the Hon. Members who spoke were from the Official Opposition.

**Mr. Malone:** How many?

**Mr. Cosgrove:** Seventeen were from the NDP.

**Mr. Thacker:** You don't care. That's your trouble.

**Mr. Cosgrove:** I would argue, in reason, that there has been ample time, ample opportunity and ample debate, no matter the complexity and the length of the amendments which are before the House.

**Mr. Young:** You must be joking, Paul.

**Mr. Cosgrove:** Why, then, do we need passage of this legislation? Why does the Government urge quick consideration and a final disposition of the legislation? The Canadian taxpayer and the Canadian economy, I submit, are waiting for the tax refunds, refunds which will total \$6.5 billion and which are important to the Canadian economy at this time.

**Mr. Thacker:** Where are you going to get the money?

**Mr. Cosgrove:** Those refunds will be enjoyed by some 11 million Canadian taxpayers. That will be a significant contribution to the movement of goods, the purchase of goods and the manufacture of goods in the Canadian economy.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Why did you take it off them in the first place?

**Mr. Cosgrove:** In addition, we in this House all know that Canadian businessmen have requested an end to the uncertainty, the process which began 16 months ago—

**Mr. Thacker:** Eighteen.

**Mr. Cosgrove:** —with the introduction of these amendments to the income tax legislation.

Almost every business group which made submissions to the Minister of Finance in the last two months, as he began his

consultative process in preparation of his next budget, indicated their wish that this House conclude disposition of these amendments to the Act as quickly as possible. Private sector entrepreneurs have asked for and need passage of this legislation to plan their actions, their investments in Canadian industry, investments which we know will create jobs.

Finally, we need passage of this legislation in order to move this House to consider new legislation, new business. The budget is being prepared by the Minister who is awaiting disposition of this Bill.

**Mr. Thacker:** It will be a dandy.

**Mr. Cosgrove:** Other legislation is before the House, including the request for interim borrowing authority pending production of the next budget, pending consideration by the House and by the public of the budget with which the Minister is now engaged.

We want to get on with this new work and with the task of preparing a foundation for recovery. We have many signals indicating the start of that recovery. We feel that it is important that we now assist that process of recovery. We believe that the business to which the House should address itself is that new business which will look to the future. We cannot allow the promise and the promising signs which are now apparent in the economy to slip from our fingers.

Some Members of Parliament have argued that the process, the complexity of this legislation by itself, creates delay and uncertainty. I would argue that this is simply a rationalization. Uncertainty, I argue, is created when legislation is stalled or when it is forced to stand in limbo through deliberate delaying tactics and political point scoring. The shame is that it is not Hon. Members who suffer as a result of that game playing, it is the ordinary Canadian and the ordinary taxpayer. It is the unemployed person in Canada, and there are too many of them, many of whom are awaiting return of refunds which cannot be made until this legislation is passed.

● (1125)

There has been ample time for debate and examination, in my submission. There is a real urgency to the passage of this legislation. I urge all Members of the House to get on with the task at hand and move this legislation as speedily as it can to a vote.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, this Income Tax Act we have before us represents the most major change in our income tax system since 1971. It brings with it a philosophical change in how we determine income. The previous tax Acts treated income as income when received. When you earn the income, when you have the income in your hands, you pay the tax. Now a new philosophy has been brought forward. We tax income when we impute income to you; not when you earn it, not when you have it in your pocket