

Income Tax Act

Mr. Paproski: You tell that to the people in the next election.

Mr. Gillespie: I am delighted to see members opposite show some interest in my remarks. They have come to life.

Mr. Paproski: Who wrote this stuff? Was it you, Hoot?

Mr. Gillespie: The details of the bill were made clear in June of last year, over six months ago. The bill was published and distributed on July 12.

Mr. Danforth: To the government members.

Mr. Gillespie: What did the Conservative members say when they came back in September? They said we were going to ram it through. The Stanfield ram came out to lead the flock.

Mr. Paproski: That is great stuff. We will use that in the next election.

Mr. Gillespie: You might need it. You may need more than that.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): He is rehearsing as a straight man for tonight.

Mr. Gillespie: What about this debate? By Friday we will have spent over 50 days of parliamentary time and yet we are accused of ramming it through. We spent 12 days on second reading and 32 days in committee of the whole and they want to send it back to the committee.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Gillespie: That does not include the six days we spent on the budget debate last June. I think this brief review of the record shows the opposition tactics for what they are. They have been aimed at trying to embarrass this government, to build up some concern, to avoid the substance of the bill and to suggest that the government is ramming it through with undue haste.

Mr. Paproski: Shame.

Mr. Gillespie: According to the tacticians opposite, that is bound to create concern. The tacticians opposite also hope to cover up the disagreements within their own party.

Mr. Paproski: Irrelevant, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gillespie: How do you feel about the capital gains tax?

Mr. Paproski: Who?

Mr. Gillespie: You. This man is behind his leader. His leader supports the principles of the capital gains tax.

Mr. Paproski: You are right.

Mr. Gillespie: All members of the Conservative party do not support it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gillespie: Are you telling me that they all support it? The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander)

asked, why the rush? He demonstrated more stamina by speaking for 20 minutes than he did perceptiveness. He is known for his persuasive powers, but they did not come through this afternoon. Nor have the persuasive powers come through from the other side because, Mr. Speaker, the tactic has been wrong. The tactic too often has been cynical. It has been aimed at creating uncertainty rather than diminishing it. A week ago, when the Leader of the Opposition brought forth his spit proclamation—

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Spit it out.

Mr. Gillespie:—split proclamation amendment. The split personality of the opposition has bothered me. He said, as recorded at page 10,272 of *Hansard*:

I agree that what I am proposing will involve some uncertainty in the business world and among taxpayers as to what will eventually be worked out and adopted as a long-range tax plan for this country.

Mr. Béchard: Who said that?

Mr. Gillespie: That was a statement by the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Danforth: I challenge the hon. member to read it in context.

Mr. Gillespie: I read it. He acknowledged there will be uncertainty until this bill is passed. He then went on to say his particular provision would create uncertainty.

Mr. Mahoney: Irresponsible.

Mr. Gillespie: On Wednesday, December 8, at 3.25 p.m., the Leader of the Opposition moved his split-the-bill amendment. It was a complicated idea, Mr. Speaker. One of the things he wanted this House to do was keep the federal government in the estate tax field. This was quite clear to those who have read the record. What did he do at 8.25 p.m.? He stood up and voted that estate taxes be eliminated as a federal responsibility.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Who did that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Again I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. I hesitate because I should have done it before when previous speakers were talking. Of course I admit that the minister did not have time to follow my advice in respect of reading what Mr. Speaker said yesterday about the rules of relevancy. The minister, however, is really placing the Chair in a very embarrassing position because other speakers will come along and ask for lenience. Then, it will be impossible to apply the rules of relevancy. At this time the debate is on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and is related only to personal income tax. I do not wish to be unfair, but I do not think the minister has said one word about the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Sit down big mouth.