

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. ROBERTS—INACCURATE REPORTS OF SPEECH—
CORRECTION TO "HANSARD"

Mr. John Roberts (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition referred to reports of my speech last week at Thunder Bay. These reports are inaccurate, but I will correct them in the normal way later on in the course of debate.

I am rather concerned, however, about *Hansard* for yesterday, page 10430, where the comment is ascribed to me, with reference to the hon. member for St. John's East, that he was "a little like the kink in 'Alice'".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Roberts: What I said was, "a little like the king in 'Alice'". I do not believe that the hon. member—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baldwin: You are the Mad Hatter.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME ALLOCATION MOTION FOR THIRD READING STAGE
OF INCOME TAX BILL

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the notice given yesterday I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson):

That the time provided for the consideration of government business in the sittings of Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, the 15th, 16th and 17th of December, 1971, be allotted for the further consideration and disposal of the third reading and passage stage of Bill C-259, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act and to make certain provisions and alterations in the statute law related to or consequential upon the amendments to that Act, and of amendments proposed thereto; and

That at 3:45 p.m. in the sitting of Friday, December 17, 1971, any proceeding then before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order, and, in turn, every question then necessary in order to dispose of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill and of any amendment thereto, shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Commons completed its 46th day spent in consideration of Bill C-259. If the motion I am proposing today is carried and put into effect, on Friday next the House will have devoted

the equivalent of 50 parliamentary days to this bill in all its stages— second reading, Committee of the Whole and third reading. By making available that considerable amount of time it has been possible for members of the House to examine all issues involved in the bill.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Nonsense!

Mr. MacEachen: The general comment is made that insufficient study has been given to the bill. Yet no precise proposals have been made as to what additional time would be justified and what unexplored aspects of the bill require further discussion.

The request to the House to pass the first time allocation motion was made by the government after the bill had been before the House for 39 days and when it was prepared to take responsibility for the implications of such a course of action. In the circumstances, we had reached a number of conclusions. We were of the opinion that spokesmen for opposition parties and members of the House generally had had sufficient opportunity to express their views on all areas of the bill, that public opinion would feel that the House of Commons was not being asked precipitately to make up its mind on the bill, that there were no areas of discussion remaining to which public attention had not been drawn, or which demanded further consideration, and that the House itself would not feel any genuine outrage that it was being treated in an unfair way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. MacEachen: At no point did I feel it was the responsibility of opposition parties to take the initiative in bringing about time allocation. Such an outcome is not even contemplated under our Standing Orders.

However, the situation today is much clearer than it was on December 2, the day when the first motion was moved. First of all, members of opposition parties are not solid in their opposition to the government's action. For example, the experienced member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has stated that the opposition has been given a fair show and it is necessary for the government to govern.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: He went on to say: "I would do the same thing if I were in the government's shoes". The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) has said that the government has a right to govern and then to be judged by the people. The Leader of the Opposition in the other place a week ago today made a suggestion to the government leader in the other place as follows:

I suggest to the hon. leader that he should persuade the government to impose closure in such a manner as to permit the Senate to deal with the bill at the beginning of next week.