

Government Orders

amendment could lead to an increase in tax payable in cases where someone receives both allowances.

• (1630)

For example, suppose an individual received \$300 of family allowance payments and \$600 old age pension payments in 1989, and that the individual's net income is \$53,000. Under the existing provisions of Bill C-28, the total tax payable as a recovery of family allowance and old age security would be \$150. Under the provisions proposed by the Senate, the total tax payable would be \$175. Thus, as this example demonstrates, the Senate proposals could actually increase the amount recovered. For this reason, they should be regarded as being out of order under the criteria set out by the hon. Speaker of the Senate in his ruling on May 31, 1990.

Under the criteria signed by the Speaker of the Senate in his ruling, the amendments should be regarded as being out of order. According to his own criteria, they are out of order.

An hon. member: I thought they were in order.

Mr. Loiselle: According to his own criteria, they are out of order.

An hon. member: But he said they were in order.

Mr. Loiselle: That is not what he said. He did not say that. He ruled differently. His criteria does not allow for this picture. There was some confusion there. If you look at it, indeed the amendments do not apply.

[*Translation*]

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, the proposed amendments are inappropriate to the Senate's legislative authority to propose amendments for tax bills. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I do not think that this House should accept such an attempted exercise of legislative power by the Senate.

[*English*]

In conclusion therefore, I move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees with amendments numbered 1 and 2 made by the Senate to Bill C-28, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, the Old Age Security Act, the Public Utilities Income Tax Transfer Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act and a related act, because the amendments

violate the traditional legislative role asserted by the Commons in fulfilment of its obligations under Sections 53 and 54 of the Constitution Act, 1867, because the amendments contradict the principles of the bill by generally decreasing the amount of revenues to be raised by the bill, and because amendment numbered 2 in some cases increases the amount of the charge.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, the speech by the Hon. Minister of State for Finance is simply incredible. I think that in preparing for today, he looked for his old speech on the 1989 Budget and he gave almost the same speech, with changes to reflect the amendments proposed by the Senate.

I must therefore make a few comments on his speech in particular and then on the amendments proposed by the Senate.

[*English*]

In dealing with Bill C-28, the government has repeatedly tried various tricks. It has had difficulty with this bill in the House. I could go through its legislative history in the chamber, but hon. members are well aware of that history. It is a bill that we in the opposition have consistently opposed.

The government has rammed it through the House. It was debated in this chamber on second reading on October 11, 17, and 18, and on November 20 the government brought in closure and forced the bill from the second reading stage to committee. It was reported back to the House and debated at report stage on December 15. On December 18, the government moved a time allocation motion. Allocation allowed for one additional day for report stage and one day for third reading. The debate at report stage was concluded on December 19 and third reading on December 20, and the bill was sent on to the Senate.

There was very limited debate in the House on this measure, which was one of the principal measures contained in the government's budget of 1989. We are still discussing it today. I know the popularity of this measure has not increased, either here or anywhere in the country.

Seniors groups throughout Canada are outraged at this clawback. I have filed if not in the hundreds, certainly dozens of petitions, in this House in opposition