

adjourn the debate, if he is not prepared to speak to the matter, he should let other members speak to the bill.

Senator Frith: No problem.

Senator Simard: That is my point. If Senator Frith—

Senator Frith: Is that your only problem?

Senator Simard: —wants to withdraw temporarily and sit on his amendment and so inform the chair, perhaps some of us can then speak to the bill.

Senator Frith: It is not an amendment. Honourable senators, I have no difficulty with that at all. I want to adjourn the debate so that I can have an opportunity to see what happened in the committee for the reasons I expressed. I cannot understand why that causes difficulty. I have known members on the other side to do that time after time after time, and it is quite reasonable.

However, if Senator Simard is saying, "Can I now speak on the debate on third reading and thereby suspend the motion to adjourn the debate," of course I am prepared to let him and anyone else, speak. But I want it to be very clear that until he said that, he was opposing the motion to adjourn the debate. I am quite prepared, as is usual when one moves the adjournment of a debate, to give other people an opportunity to speak. Of course I am perfectly happy to do that as long as it is clear that it is being suspended and that the motion that will be put after every senator who wants to has spoken, is to adjourn the debate.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, I repeat for the third time, it is moved by the Honourable Senator Frith, seconded by the Honourable Senator Molgat, that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting.

Senator Frith: That is the motion. Senator Simard is asking, for whatever good reason, to speak now. He is the sponsor of the bill. Will I yield on the motion to adjourn in order to give him a chance to speak to the third reading debate? Of course I am perfectly happy to have him do that, as well as anyone else who wishes. However, when that debate is all finished, I want the motion to adjourn to be put. By that, I mean adjourn the debate; not the Senate.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Senator Simard.

[Translation]

Senator Simard: It is so unusual for Senator Frith to be unclear that I was puzzled by what I had heard. Even his Honourable the Speaker did not seem to understand what Senator Frith meant because he had not been as clear as usual.

I thank him for allowing us to proceed at this time with Bill C-18 and to deal with the reasons why we believe this bill must be passed as soon as possible.

As I said earlier, this legislation affects several other pieces of legislation. It is an impressive document which, admittedly, has had to be considered in a very short time.

A clearer format would have been welcome. At any rate, as honourable senators know full well, this bill, if passed, will have a positive effect on the situation of many taxpayers.

[Senator Simard.]

This is, in our opinion, a strong reason for the Senate to pass this bill.

• (1010)

[English]

I will provide a brief overview of the bill and then discuss some specifics. I will not repeat all the arguments I made when I spoke to the bill on second reading. I will try to address the points that Senator Frith and others have addressed in this chamber and in committee; points with respect to which answers were received in committee.

Bill C-18 incorporates the income tax measures that were included in the budgets of 1990 and 1991; several items which were announced through press releases in 1990 and 1991; and a large number of technical amendments that were originally announced in July of 1990. It is important to make clear that, with the exception of the 1991 budget measures, all the items that are included in the bill have been released for public reaction, and a number of changes were made in response to comments obtained through public consultation.

Although the bill was received this week from the other place, it has been circulating on the Hill for several months, at least since the spring. The measures and technical changes contained in the bill have been discussed at length by all kinds of organizations, tax experts, community groups and northerners who will be affected by some of these changes. Not only has the discussion on these measures been ongoing since May of this year, some of them have been discussed for two or three years. Some incorporate necessary measures that have been in the works since 1985.

I will say later how the government intends to follow the recommendations of our committee and how it intends to bring forward changes on a more timely basis so that we do not have to deal with so many clauses all at once every five or six years.

Among the subjects dealt with in the bill are: donations and certifications of cultural property; foreign-controlled mutual funds; dispositions of real property by residents; registered education savings plan limits; foreign property limits for pension plans; and an extension of the capital tax imposed on financial institutions to life insurers. Other provisions deal with improved tax treatment for the disabled, for artists and for small business corporations going public. Many measures are designed to make the tax system more effective and fair, such as the provisions dealing with northern benefits and allowances. Surely, Liberal senators will not be against these type of measures.

Senator Stewart: To which clause are you referring, Senator Simard, please?

Senator Simard: Look it up in the book. You will find it, even though I know you were not there.

Senator Frith: It has 396 pages. Can you at least say it is in the 300s?

Senator Simard: I must admit that I am not legally trained. It does not matter if it is clause 46(b) or 195(z). It is there in the bill. Find it. You will understand.