

Latam Daily: Peru Constitutional Court Ratifies Status Quo; Argentina Wealth Tax

- **Argentina: Tax and pension reforms advance**
- **Peru: Constitutional Court ratifies the status quo, but avoids defining “moral incapacity”**

ARGENTINA: TAX AND PENSION REFORMS ADVANCE

Early on Wednesday, November 18, Argentina’s lower house, the Chamber of Deputies, approved a bill for what the government claims will be a one-off tax on the assets of wealthy individuals. The tax would be imposed on Argentine households—not companies—whose declared assets exceed ARS 200 mn (USD 2.5 mn at the current official exchange rate of USDARS 80.27) and would scale up progressively to a maximum of 3.5% on assets in Argentina and 5.25% on assets held outside of the country. Estimates imply that the tax would affect somewhere between 9,000 and 12,000 people; the authorities hope it would raise about USD 3 bn, equivalent to about 0.7% of GDP. Related revenues would be earmarked as follows: 20% for COVID-19-related medical supplies, 20% for programs to help SMEs, 15% for social development programs, 20% for student scholarships, and 25% for natural-gas development programs. The bill has moved to the Senate where it is due to be debated before end-November.

Wealth taxes have been tried and abandoned in several advanced economies and emerging markets, in part because they rarely raise the funds projected, are easily circumvented, push capital abroad, and violate the principle that the same income shouldn’t be taxed twice. Such a levy would not likely feature in IMF conditionality for the new EFF loan under negotiation.

The Argentine authorities also moved ahead on Wednesday with adjustments to the public pension system. The government announced that pensions would increase by 5.0% in December, above October’s 3.8% m/m headline inflation rate, but this implies a 35% y/y nominal increase for 2020 as a whole, spot on our forecast for the year’s increase in the national CPI (see our November 14 [Latam Weekly](#)). At the same time, the government is pressing ahead with the development of a systematic framework for future pension adjustments that will likely feature in any program eventually agreed with the IMF since pensions account for nearly two-thirds of public spending.

The national government’s October budget balance is due for publication later today. Economy Minister Guzman has promised that the Treasury would not draw on BCRA financing in November and December, which may imply he foresaw a narrowing in the deficit in October on the back of further recovery in the economy.

—Brett House

CONTACTS

Brett House, VP & Deputy Chief Economist
416.863.7463
Scotiabank Economics
brett.house@scotiabank.com

Guillermo Arbe
51.1.211.6052 (Peru)
Scotiabank Peru
guillermo.arbe@scotiabank.com.pe

Mario Correa
52.55.5123.2683 (Mexico)
Scotiabank Mexico
mcorrea@scotiabank.com.mx

Sergio Olarte
57.1.745.6300 (Colombia)
Scotiabank Colombia
sergio.olarte@co.scotiabank.com

Jorge Selaive
56.2.2939.1092 (Chile)
Scotiabank Chile
jorge.selaive@scotiabank.cl

Marc Ercolao
416.866.6252
Scotiabank Economics
marc.ercolao@scotiabank.com

PERU: CONSTITUTIONAL COURT RATIFIES THE STATUS QUO, BUT AVOIDS DEFINING “MORAL INCAPACITY”

In a four-to-three vote, the Constitutional Court (Tribunal Constitucional) found that Congress did not violate the Constitution in removing ex-President Vizcarra. Furthermore, in an extremely controversial decision, the Court also held, essentially, that there was no reason to provide a more precise definition of the Constitution’s concept of “moral incapacity” as grounds for the removal by Congress of a President.

What this means:

1. The removal of ex-President Vizcarra was not unconstitutional;
2. All acts that followed, including Merino’s resignation and the designation of Francisco Sagasti to the Presidency, are valid. The *status quo* remains; and
3. In the future, Congress has total freedom to interpret the concept of “moral incapacity” as cause for removing a President. In practice, the only requirement would be to obtain 87 votes out of 130, i.e., a two-thirds majority.

After the ruling was announced, different members of the Court gave different reasonings for the decision. One argument given was that the issue had become moot: events had moved on. Another point made was that the ruling reflected political prudence and an effort to avoid inflaming the political climate. More controversially, one member of the Court floated the idea that the concept of moral incapacity should be vague in order to provide flexibility for each particular situation.

The Court’s decision is likely to affect the prestige of the Court itself, but it’s hard to see a situation arising in which Congress would once again seek the removal of a President in the short term. In the medium run, Congress itself has the wherewithal to define the concept of moral incapacity in the Constitution. This will probably not occur under the current Congress, but could take place in a future one.

—Guillermo Arbe

This report has been prepared by Scotiabank Economics as a resource for the clients of Scotiabank. Opinions, estimates and projections contained herein are our own as of the date hereof and are subject to change without notice. The information and opinions contained herein have been compiled or arrived at from sources believed reliable but no representation or warranty, express or implied, is made as to their accuracy or completeness. Neither Scotiabank nor any of its officers, directors, partners, employees or affiliates accepts any liability whatsoever for any direct or consequential loss arising from any use of this report or its contents.

These reports are provided to you for informational purposes only. This report is not, and is not constructed as, an offer to sell or solicitation of any offer to buy any financial instrument, nor shall this report be construed as an opinion as to whether you should enter into any swap or trading strategy involving a swap or any other transaction. The information contained in this report is not intended to be, and does not constitute, a recommendation of a swap or trading strategy involving a swap within the meaning of U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission Regulation 23.434 and Appendix A thereto. This material is not intended to be individually tailored to your needs or characteristics and should not be viewed as a “call to action” or suggestion that you enter into a swap or trading strategy involving a swap or any other transaction. Scotiabank may engage in transactions in a manner inconsistent with the views discussed in this report and may have positions, or be in the process of acquiring or disposing of positions, referred to in this report.

Scotiabank, its affiliates and any of their respective officers, directors and employees may from time to time take positions in currencies, act as managers, co-managers or underwriters of a public offering or act as principals or agents, deal in, own or act as market makers or advisors, brokers or commercial and/or investment bankers in relation to securities or related derivatives. As a result of these actions, Scotiabank may receive remuneration. All Scotiabank products and services are subject to the terms of applicable agreements and local regulations. Officers, directors and employees of Scotiabank and its affiliates may serve as directors of corporations.

Any securities discussed in this report may not be suitable for all investors. Scotiabank recommends that investors independently evaluate any issuer and security discussed in this report, and consult with any advisors they deem necessary prior to making any investment.

This report and all information, opinions and conclusions contained in it are protected by copyright. This information may not be reproduced without the prior express written consent of Scotiabank.

TM Trademark of The Bank of Nova Scotia. Used under license, where applicable.

Scotiabank, together with “Global Banking and Markets”, is a marketing name for the global corporate and investment banking and capital markets businesses of The Bank of Nova Scotia and certain of its affiliates in the countries where they operate, including; Scotiabank Europe plc; Scotiabank (Ireland) Designated Activity Company; Scotiabank Inverlat S.A., Institución de Banca Múltiple, Grupo Financiero Scotiabank Inverlat, Scotia Inverlat Casa de Bolsa, S.A. de C.V., Grupo Financiero Scotiabank Inverlat, Scotia Inverlat Derivados S.A. de C.V. – all members of the Scotiabank group and authorized users of the Scotiabank mark. The Bank of Nova Scotia is incorporated in Canada with limited liability and is authorized and regulated by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada. The Bank of Nova Scotia is authorized by the UK Prudential Regulation Authority and is subject to regulation by the UK Financial Conduct Authority and limited regulation by the UK Prudential Regulation Authority. Details about the extent of The Bank of Nova Scotia’s regulation by the UK Prudential Regulation Authority are available from us on request. Scotiabank Europe plc is authorized by the UK Prudential Regulation Authority and regulated by the UK Financial Conduct Authority and the UK Prudential Regulation Authority.

Scotiabank Inverlat, S.A., Scotia Inverlat Casa de Bolsa, S.A. de C.V., Grupo Financiero Scotiabank Inverlat, and Scotia Inverlat Derivados, S.A. de C.V., are each authorized and regulated by the Mexican financial authorities.

Not all products and services are offered in all jurisdictions. Services described are available in jurisdictions where permitted by law.