

Time Allocation for Bill C-30

Our parliamentary system is based on the House of Commons having the final say. How can we have the final say on the appropriateness of the government's borrowing \$12 billion when we have no idea what the government intends to use that \$12 billion for? Would that be responsible?

Mr. Dinsdale: No.

Mr. Deans: I ask hon. members whether they could tell their constituents how they acted on their behalf. I ask the Liberal backbenchers whether they could tell their constituents that they had acted on their behalf, that they kept a check on government expenditures, that they carefully scrutinized what the money was to be used for and then gave the government the authority to borrow. Government members cannot say that. Therefore, government members have no right to ask this House to pass this motion and the subsequent borrowing bill.

I suggest that the government is moving too hastily on this matter. Instead it should have said that because of oil price negotiations and other extraneous matters a budget cannot be in place before the fall and that it needs to go into the marketplace to borrow from time to time in order to maintain the fiscal affairs of the country. The government should have said that between now and then it will need some borrowing authority from the House of Commons and that this will be asked for quarterly or once every six months until such time as it places before Parliament what its program is going to be. Had the government done that, there would have been no difficulty. It would have passed with very little comment and the government could have gone about its business.

I say to the government that it has no right, that it is outrageous, to ask the House of Commons to give it borrowing powers for an entire year—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please; I regret to interrupt the hon. member.

● (1700)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Cousineau (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, it is not out of pleasure that I rise today to make my remarks and comment on this motion introduced by our House leader, but rather because I feel it is my duty so the people of Canada will know what is happening, so they will be well informed and will be able to draw their own conclusions about what opposition members have been doing.

Mr. Speaker, on May 21 last, the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) brought forward Bill C-30 in this House for first reading. A few days later, on May 27, the Minister of Finance asked that the bill be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. Then the former finance minister, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) spoke for 97 minutes. Mr. Speaker, during one hour and 37 minutes, the hon. member for St. John's West addressed this House and the people of Canada or perhaps thought he was addressing the people of Canada with

the verve he is known for, and he spoke again for ten minutes this afternoon. What struck me the most in the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's West—one cannot help noticing it—is his fondness for the word “budget.”

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser)—Cultural affairs—Government support for Vancouver Art Gallery; the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie)—Industry—Proposal for installation of syncrolift in St. John's dockyard; the hon. member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly)—Search and rescue—Inquiry why capability on west coast not upgraded.

[*English*]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS RESPECTING CHARITABLE GIFTS

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act in order to give individual taxpayers the option of claiming charitable gifts as deductions from taxable income or of deducting 50 per cent of the value of charitable gifts from income tax payable, and amending the present \$100 standard tax deduction for medical and charitable purposes to apply only to medical expenses.

He said: The purpose of the motion, Mr. Speaker, that I am bringing before the House today is to help voluntary organizations make a greater contribution to the quality of life in Canada. Specifically, I am urging the government to amend the Income Tax Act; first, to remove the standard \$100 deduction for charitable donations and, second, to replace the standard deduction with a 50 per cent tax credit along with the option of continuing to deduct charitable contributions from taxable income if it is in the taxpayer's interest to do so.