

Mr. Speaker: Senator David, I am sorry to interrupt but first we must complete third reading of the bill.

[English]

Senator Frith: Yes, that is quite right, we are at third reading, but the legislation has not yet been passed. The sponsor of the bill has spoken on it. Yesterday we were hoping that both sides could settle on an addendum to the report before we gave it third reading. I believe that is what Senator David is about to do and, of course, we will support him. I understand we have all agreed—

Senator Lynch-Staunton: He wants to do it after third reading.

Senator Frith: That may be so, but I want to hear—

Senator Lynch-Staunton: That is the procedure.

Senator Frith: The addendum to the report can proceed after third reading. However, in view of yesterday's debates, it seems to me appropriate for Senator David to say that consultations did take place, and that he will propose this change to the report. The addendum is, of course, relevant to our support for third reading of the bill. So you should tell us what you intend to do, Senator, and then we will have third reading.

[Translation]

Senator David: Thank you, senator Frith. So, I move:

THAT the Message to be sent to the House of Commons acquainting that House that the Senate have passed the Bill C-39, An Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, the Family Allowances Act and the Old Age Security Act, contain the following comments:—

Given the complexity of the subject matter of the Bill and the time given for its examination, the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology will want to give further consideration to this matter in the early period of the legislation's application including the concern of the division of spouses' credits and matters relating to disability.

This is the new part, Senator Frith.

The Committee suggests that there should be an automatic splitting of CPP credits upon the dissolution of marriage. While an opting out provision might prevail, the low rate of take-up of the current pension credit splitting scheme is inadequate as is evidenced by the numbers.

[English]

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, the report that Senator David presented yesterday, being a report of a committee on a bill, reporting the bill without amendment, stands adopted without debate. So there was no debate on that motion yesterday. Then we discussed the possibility of having unanimous consent to an amendment to that report, or an addendum to that record, because we felt that would be relevant to third reading debate, just as the report is relevant to third reading debate. I propose that we give unanimous consent to have this addition made to the report, and it having been made, it seems

[Senator David.]

to me relevant for us then to proceed to adopt the bill at third reading. I think that would probably suit Senator Lavoie-Roux equally, because she made reference to it herself.

• (1520)

Therefore, with unanimous consent, I believe we can adopt Senator David's motion and then put the motion for third reading.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: That is what we said.

Senator David: This draft, Senator Frith, was made in consultation with Senators Marsden, Kinsella, Lavoie-Roux and myself.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, we must go through third reading first and then vote on the motion of Senator David.

Senator Frith: We would, but that is a matter of procedure. We are now saying, as we proposed yesterday and are now able to do, that we certainly could not do what we are doing now without unanimous consent. However, if we have unanimous consent, there is no question that we can adopt this addendum. It is appropriate that we do, because the report of the committee is very relevant to the debate at third reading. It seems to me we avoid additional debate at third reading by simply adopting this addendum, because everyone agrees that we want it added to the report, and everyone agrees that, apart from that having been done, we want to give the bill third reading.

I underline that the Speaker is quite right if we have no unanimous consent. However, we have unanimous consent to this procedure at this time. We should do it that way, because that seems to me to be exactly what the house wants to do.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION BILL, 1991

SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. William M. Kelly moved the second reading of Bill C-20, to amend certain statutes to implement the budget tabled in Parliament on February 26, 1991.

He said: Honourable senators, I rise to speak on Bill C-20, an act to amend certain statutes to implement the February 26, 1991 budget statement.

I apologize in advance, honourable senators, because I am losing my voice.

This bill is an omnibus bill. It groups together amendments to three separate statutes: The Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contribution Act; the Public Utilities Income Tax Transfer Act; and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

As indicated in the bill's title, these statutes are being amended in order to implement certain fiscal arrangements announced by the previous Minister of Finance in the last