

On motion of Senator Doody, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting.

INCOME TAX ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Flynn, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Walker, P.C., for the second reading of the Bill C-7, intituled: "An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and related statutes".—(*Honourable Senator Kolber*).

Hon. Leo E. Kolber: Honourable senators, I have a few brief remarks to make on this bill and I also wish to voice a few concerns. First of all, it is interesting to note that most of the measures contained in this bill originated from the budget of the Honourable Marc Lalonde of February 1984. It is also interesting to note that the economic statement made by the Honourable Michael Wilson has resulted in very few concrete steps, most of which were also contained in this same budget of the Honourable Marc Lalonde.

I do have several concerns with respect to this bill. The bill changes the provision governing the period of filing the notice of objection to a tax assessment reducing it from 180 days to 90 days. I understand that this is in anticipation of a much more efficient Revenue Canada. However, until that is an actuality, I wonder if we are being fair to our taxpayers.

My second concern is that Marc Lalonde's February budget contained a provision which would have allowed the taxpayer to give to the Minister of National Revenue satisfactory security for taxes which were in dispute. This provision has been deleted. I note that, in the Speech from the Throne, the government stated its intention to refrain from accepting advance payments until the matter had been settled by a court. While that is certainly an eminently fair position, that test has not yet taken place. Therefore, at this moment, we are in an interim or hiatus period and, in my opinion, some clarification in this area is necessary.

The last comment I have to make is that it would appear that the government has suspended advance rulings. This position is not consistent with the stated intention of this government to instil confidence in business. In my opinion, this is not a good way to achieve that goal.

Having said those things and with those concerns and caveats, I certainly would recommend the adoption of this bill

Hon. Jacques Flynn: Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*: I wish to inform the Senate that, if the Honourable Senator Flynn speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of this bill.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jacques Flynn: I thank Senator Kolber for his comments. I note that he did not suggest that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. I

[*The Hon. the Speaker.*]

should like to know whether he thinks it would be of some use if I were to move the motion so that he might have answers to the points he raised.

Unless I am mistaken, the bill does not make any reference to the last point raised by Senator Kolber. He is probably referring to an administrative ruling. I do not think the legislation provides for the suspension of advance rulings by Revenue Canada when so requested. I do not recall hearing anything about it.

Should Senator Kolber want to have answers to those three questions, I would certainly move that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

[*English*]

Senator Kolber: I do not think that will be necessary.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Yes, it is.

Senator Kolber: I bow to my leader.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I think this bill should be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

On motion of Senator Flynn, bill referred to Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

THE SENATE

OFFICE OF SPEAKER

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Riel, P.C., calling the attention of the Senate to his tenure as Speaker of the Senate, his experiences and his recommendations to the Senate.—(*Honourable Senator Riel, P.C.*)

Hon. Maurice Riel: I am very glad with this opportunity to continue my speech, especially since I realized I forgot something very important, which always happens when you are in a hurry as I was the other day. I also would like to elaborate on a number of points.

I forgot a short paragraph which I thought was rather apt and which I had written especially for the new speaker *pro tempore*, and so I will give it to you now. Senator Asselin, who is now our "permanent" Speaker *pro tempore*, as they say in the United States, is a distinguished parliamentarian in the grand tradition. I am sure the senator will find it very difficult not to rise and take part in our daily debates.

I am sure that at times his temper will rise, but that, like all Speakers of the Senate, he will remain in his moderating role and exercise the authority that role confers on him.