

*Income Tax Act*

the government was going to try to ram this thing through. Getting away from the confusion tactic we now get to the ramming through tactic. His leader picked this one up, and I think one might say that his leader has preempted the ram. I think we might describe it as the Stanfield ram.

I shall have more to say about the Stanfield ram, but over and over again we have been hearing this expression about the government trying to ram things through. I remember the hon. member for Edmonton West saying on one occasion to the committee, when the committee decided that it was time to bring its hearings to some sort of orderly close, that we were trying to ram things through. The hon. member will remember that we started our meetings early in the year. The Minister of Finance appeared before the committee, as I recall it, on January 15. He again started to accuse the committee of ramming something through when we decided that the public hearings before the committee should terminate early in July.

**Mr. Danforth:** When the government decided, not the committee.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** The message came through.

**Mr. Gillespie:** That was the tactic, but it was a false tactic. Let us look at the record for a moment. I know many hon. members have made this point, but I think it is worth making again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I hesitate to interrupt the minister, mainly because I should have said this while the hon. member for Moose Jaw was speaking, but I think I should invite hon. members who are participating or who will participate in the debate to read the remarks in *Hansard* of Mr. Speaker while he was in the Chair yesterday, as reported at pages 10470, 10471, 10472 and 10473, at which time he invited hon. members to confine their remarks as closely as possible to the amendment that is before the House at this time.

I am sure all hon. members will agree with me when I say that the rule of relevancy has not been closely applied by the Chair either in the House or in committee during this debate. But we have now reached third reading, having already had a two hour general debate on the motion. An amendment has been voted on and there is now before the House another amendment. If hon. members are going to reopen the general debate on the bill every time an amendment is moved, this will make it very difficult for the Chair to apply the rule of relevancy. Since I did not bring this point to the attention of other members when they went beyond the scope of the bill the Chair does not want to be unfair to the minister, but I do think that my remarks should be taken as an invitation to be relevant.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Speaker, in your own inimitable way you have put the point gently and forcefully and I, of course respect your direction in this regard. Because I had not fully developed my remarks, perhaps I might have led you to believe that I was not keeping to the point. Let me hasten to add that I am very much concerned with the amendment and with the position taken by the opposition, as summed up in the words of the hon. member for

[Mr. Gillespie.]

Hamilton West—"Why the rush?" What I want to try to do is to deal with that because it does bear directly on the question whether this bill should be referred back to committee of the whole House or rather should be finally dealt with on third reading. Therefore, may I just continue to highlight very briefly the record. I mentioned that the hon. member for Edmonton West stated we were trying to ram things through in 1970.

• (4.30 p.m.)

**Mr. Paproski:** Irrelevant, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Gillespie:** No, it is not. He found difficulty in coming to terms with the committee report. He did not know whether to vote for it or not. He decided not to. He rushed to a press conference in Victoria and said this was all a sham. Those are his words. He said that the government had made up its mind. That was over a year ago.

**Mr. Paproski:** Those are falsehoods.

**Mr. Gillespie:** They are not. They are on the record. The point I am trying to make is that throughout this whole debate the opposition tactic has been that "the government is trying to railroad this through. Give us more time. Let's go back and look at it in detail". I hope to expose some of the transparency of this position in some of my later remarks.

The budget debate last June took place some eight months after the committee filed its report in the House. There had been considerable time taken by various interests throughout the nation to put their points to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). When we got into the debate, we saw the opposition again reveal its dilemma. They were not sure whether they should react favourably to the bill that was presented to the House in June and take credit for the changes in it or whether they should criticize it. Those of us who were sitting on this side of the House that day well remember the consternation on the faces of members opposite. They wondered what they should do and how they should react. The summer recess definitely saved them.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Gillespie:** So much did they take shelter in the summer recess that some of them even forgot to look at the bill. Some even suggested they did not receive the bill on July 12.

**Mr. Danforth:** That is correct; only the government members received it then.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Check the record. It was delivered to the offices of your leader and your research staff on July 12. The truth hurts.

**Mr. Paproski:** If the shoe fits, you know what.

**Mr. Gillespie:** When they saw the bill last June, the changes effected in it and saw the influence which the committee had on the bill, they worried because the participatory process was being legitimized. Participation is not part of the character of the official opposition. It is not part of their tradition. The participatory process is not a part of their tradition.