

Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements

whether or not the Bill should come into force on or before April 1, 1987, and assume that the Chair will allow a vote to be taken on that matter. I would like the Chair to consider whether we might deal with Motion No. 4 rather than Motion No. 1. I would be interested to hear from my colleague in the Liberal Party as to whether he thinks that may be a reasonable way of dealing with it.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) on the same point of order.

Mr. Garneau: Yes. Mr. Speaker, if we look at the proposals or motions that are in my name, clearly they are interrelated to a large extent—quite apart from the ruling you will be making on the motion or motions—because several of them require that the Bill become effective as of April 1st, 1987. Sure enough, if you find them unacceptable, if you say this motion is unacceptable, this will impact on the others also. And motion No. 4, which of course could be debated separately, no doubt could be debatable, but inasmuch as you will have made a ruling, as my colleague said earlier on motion No. 1, if it applies to motion No. 4.

This is why I was suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that in the meantime, before you make a ruling, the Deputy House Leader could allow us to return to Bill C-75, and when you are ready to hand out your ruling, then the discussion might be resumed. We would be saving the time of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Then, in order to avoid wasting more time than is needed, I am pleased to announce to Hon. Members that I will be in a position to make the ruling I had to postpone a few minutes ago.

● (1600)

[English]

There are five report stage motions on today's *Notice Paper* in amendment to Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977. The Chair has had an opportunity to look at all the motions standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau). Unfortunately it must rule that Motions No. 1 to 4 infringe on the financial initiative of the Crown and are therefore out of order. In this regard I would refer the Hon. Member to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773, paragraph seven.

I must also rule Motion No. 5 out of order, with regret, on the grounds that it attempts to amend the parent Act. I again refer the Hon. Member to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773, paragraph eight.

If the Hon. Member wishes to present procedural arguments as to the acceptability of the amendments, I am prepared to hear such arguments now.

[Translation]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, when introducing these motions, particularly Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, I was indeed expecting that you might want to reject these amendments on the basis of the argument you have just made. But with respect to Motion No. 5 which would set a termination date—a sunset clause, as it is commonly called—it seems to me that it does not affect the Government's prerogative to introduce tax measures because it would instead set a limit on public expenditures. Nothing would prevent the Government from coming back with the Bill if it wanted to and, with all due respect to the Chair, I would suggest that Motion No. 5 should be considered as being different in the sense that it does not provide for additional public outlays, on the contrary, it puts a limit on them.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): While I appreciate the nature of the argument by the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau)—

[Translation]

I fully appreciate the meaning of his argument. Nevertheless I must conclude that Motion No. 5 introduced by the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides is procedurally unacceptable.

Therefore the House shall proceed to third reading of the Bill.

[English]

Mr. Epp (Provencher) (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Epp (Provencher) (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

[Translation]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, we are now in the last stage of the study of Bill C-96. Both on second reading and in committee, the Official Opposition has tried to focus on the unfairness of this measure, and our argument has been that the Conservative Government is saddling the provinces with this tax load just to be able to tell Canadians that the financial situation has improved, disregarding the fact that the provinces will have to pick up the tab. In an attempt to make people believe that Bill C-96 does not really change anything much, the Department of Finance put out a brochure which does not quite give the whole truth. It indicates what post-secondary education and health program transfer payments to the provinces will eventually amount to, but the document conveniently skips over what these transfer payments would have been had Bill C-96 not been introduced in the House. In a nutshell, what this Bill does is to slow the growth of transfer payments, so much so that the explanation given by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in his Budget statement was that the Government wanted to save \$2 billion during the fiscal year 1990-91.