

## S.O. 43

Toronto which has produced a play entitled "Winter Offensive".

I hope, Mr. Speaker, when I give the words of this motion they will not be offensive to anyone, because they are quoted from *Hansard*. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

Whereas the Secretary of State has made the shocking admission in an answer to my order paper question No. 1,168 that this play includes scenes showing a character smearing his face with human excrement, a wounded man's insides spilling out on the floor, and references to the "insatiable sexual urges and sadistic drives of Mrs. Adolf Eichmann", that the House deplores the minister's refusal to furnish full information to members of parliament on the decision-making process used by the Canada Council for the spending of public funds, and the House demands an immediate parliamentary investigation of the Canada Council.

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion for debate requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

## FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

EQUALITY OF PROVINCES IN CONFEDERATION—MOTION  
UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 43. In light of the serious consequences the discussion on taxation has to the unity of this country, considering the federal government has grievously undermined equity and fairness by not bargaining in good faith with the provinces of Canada, and considering the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is further balkanizing this country by speaking of the Canadian common market as though Canada were some loose conglomeration of sovereign nation states instead of one coherent sovereign entity, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That this House affirm that Canada is a federal state comprising of a national government for all Canadians, and ten equal provincial partners.

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

## CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

SHIPMENT OF GRAIN THROUGH CHURCHILL, MAN.—MOTION  
UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Now that grain shipments through Churchill and Prince Rupert have fallen even further behind, and in

[Mr. Cossitt.]

view of the fact that CIDA grain shipments are under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board and the port of Churchill is capable of handling an additional five million bushels of grain this season, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway):

That the government take immediate action to direct the Canadian Wheat Board to ship at least a minimum of five million bushels of CIDA grain through the port of Churchill this season.

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion for debate would require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## FINANCE

## SALES TAX—EFFECT ON PROVINCES OF DIFFERENT TREATMENT

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Prime Minister stated that the same deal on tax room was being offered to all the provinces. I still question that, but the point I want to clarify now is this: will the Prime Minister not concede that the effect of this proposal will be that individuals in the province of Quebec will be affected in a much different way than individuals in the provinces which have agreed to an across-the-board reduction in sales tax, and that that effect will be a sort of reverse means test so that in the province of Quebec only those individuals who have an income high enough to pay income tax will benefit, whereas in the other provinces all purchasers of goods and services will benefit?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, with respect, the hon. lady is confusing two things: the federal action and the provincial response. In so far as the federal action is concerned, it is the same in all provinces which accepted the scheme and it is the same in Quebec. We are cutting taxes and making room so the provinces can increase their income tax. So, from our point of view it is the same in all provinces.

Obviously, what the provinces are delivering is different. Eight of the provinces have said, "Yes, we will agree. We will cut the sales tax across-the-board three points." One province has said, "No, we will not agree. We will cut them in the way we want." So to the extent that they have cut them differently, the hon. lady is right. Mr. Parizeau, the same minister who was so ardently supported by her colleagues on the other side, is responsible for this type of reverse discrimination.