

ends my remarks. The author is Dawson, *The Government of Canada*, sixth edition, 1987 and I quote:

It is a fair statement that almost the only attention the Senate has given to this grand assertion is to ignore it. On the theoretical side the Senate has argued that if the constitution was intended to limit the Senate's power over money bills once initiated, it would say so. The Senate has insisted further that it could not discharge its functions as a guardian of provincial or regional rights if it had no power over money bills. What is more important is that the Senate has repeatedly amended bills that contained money clauses, and also bills that dealt exclusively with finance, including income tax bills. The Commons has accepted Senate amendments to money bills, usually adding a futile claim that its acquiescence must not be considered a precedent. The Senate could, if practice is any guide, amend a money bill out of all recognition, so that in effect the bill was rejected.

In its amendment to Bill C-21, the Senate has taken a much more moderate course of action than I just described.

I know there are other members in this House who would like to address this issue, explain the impact of the procedure before us and go on to explain why we should indeed accept the message of the Senate and pass it.

Having taken the time of the House, I apologize if at times I was repetitive. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that given the fact that we were given no notice of this debate today, the minister not having thought to give us prior notice of at least a half an hour, or even an hour, we will continue to debate this motion in due course. When we get to the substantive message, whenever it is called, I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if I may comment further on this process.

\* \* \*

### EXCISE TAX ACT

#### NOTICE OF ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-62

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, because this particular point of order may be carried on for some while, I wish to indicate that agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) and 78(2) with respect to an allocation of time to the report stage and third reading of Bill C-62, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Criminal Code, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Excise Act, the Income Tax Act, the Statistics Act, and the Tax Court of Canada Act.

#### *Time Allocation*

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allowing a specified number of days or a day for the consideration and disposal at both stages of the said bill.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** We have another example of either—I do not want to use the word “arrogance”, I am trying to find another word. Mr. Speaker, it is not debate. It is a point of order and it is a good one.

The debate on Bill C-62 at report stage has not started. It has not started yet. The order was called by the House at one o'clock and the House adjourned at one o'clock. I submit that the notice given is not in order because the debate has not started. Just calling the order does not mean the debate has started. There has been nobody in this House that has addressed this issue as of now and I maintain—

[*Translation*]

—that the whole process is biased, it is the only word I can think of, because neither the House nor the committee has had a chance to study the bill. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this point of order is extremely serious and that once again the government is making a mistake because it wants to push it, to bully it through and do things its own way regardless of the Standing Orders of the House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I have been in the House for over an hour listening to my normally eloquent and concise friend on a point of order for an hour.

As the Speaker knows, the order was called this morning. The minister made an intervention on this point of order of 20 minutes. The hon. member chose to go on for 60 minutes and if that is what he chooses to do, that is fine. At the same time it is very clear that the debate was called today. The order was called. The debate has started. If the opposition chooses to speak 60 minutes on a point of order, that is their option. The other option is to continue with Orders of the Day.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, your patience is being tested quite severely today.