

Income Tax Act

Quebec Minister of Finance, Mr. Parizeau, dated June 7, 1978.

The Chairman: Order, please. To table the document, the House should not be in committee of the whole and the Speaker should be in the Chair. So the hon. minister might perhaps do so on another occasion. In any case, in the meantime he can still circulate the letter among hon. members, unless he proposes to have it appended to today's *Hansard* with the unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I have a few more copies, so I can give them to a few hon. members, but I have not enough copies for everybody.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I was about to suggest what you suggested to the minister namely, that he ask consent for this letter to be debated and appended to today's *Hansard*. That way we will have it in both languages, and everybody will have it.

The Chairman: Hon. members have heard the proposition that the letter referred to by the minister, written by the minister of finance of the province of Quebec to the federal Minister of Finance, be appended to today's *Hansard*. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For letter above referred to, see Appendix.*]

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank hon. members for their consideration in allowing this letter to be appended to today's *Hansard*.

Would the minister indicate if he has prepared or sent a reply to the minister of finance of the province of Quebec in respect of the June 7 letter we have just appended to *Hansard*?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and I also want to reply to the hon. member. First of all, I have just received the letter, barely a few hours ago. I am willing to answer the question but I do think the question of the hon. member is out of order, in that the letter deals not with clause 1 of the bill but with clause 30. Therefore, we can discuss its contents when we reach that clause.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I also rise on a point of order.

The Chairman: The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, on a point of order.

Mr. Pinard: A while ago, I thought that on a very special question you allowed an hon. member to put a question in order to obtain the letter explaining clause 30. But I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that in fact you called clause 1

[Mr. Chrétien.]

which we are to discuss, and that clause 30 will be considered in due course. We have spent 11 days on second reading and the hon. members can think only of clause 30.

The Chairman: Order. I should like to point out to the hon. member that I gave a ruling, that I gave it in good faith for the orderly working of the committee, perhaps precisely to speed up progress on the bill. The hon. member indicated to the Chair that he had specific questions to put to the Minister of Finance to clear up certain points and that those questions might possibly speed up study of the bill if they were cleared up. It is not up to me to decide whether replies meet with the satisfaction of the hon. member. I allowed him to put his questions, and it is up to him to decide. If the Minister of Finance does not want to answer, that is up to him. As for me, I know that under our rules of procedure, we generally allow a general debate on clause 1 in committee of the whole. We do not restrict ourselves to clause 1 of the bill. It is in that spirit that, in order to speed up somewhat consideration of the bill, I allowed the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) to put his question, and my ruling has been made on that matter. The hon. member for York-Simcoe.

[*English*]

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I was simply trying to identify which letter it is that we will be referring to during the committee of the whole, and secondly, if in fact there had been any formal reply sent by the minister. I can well understand, if the Minister of Finance has only had a few hours to deal with the letter, that he would not yet have sent a reply.

I feel it would be helpful if the minister could give us an outline of what the general reply will be with respect to the proposals put forth by Mr. Parizeau concerning Bill C-56. I would emphasize that the letter we are referring to does not refer to specific clauses of Bill C-56; it refers to the entire bill. I think it is quite in order that we raise various questions pertinent to the current status of negotiations between the province of Quebec and the federal government relating to the provincial sales tax—income tax adjustment provisions.

First of all, did I understand the minister correctly during question period today when he mentioned that the \$40 million that Mr. Parizeau refers to in the original paragraph of his letter is in fact an amount that the government is going to pay to Quebec, and will pay without too much delay?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, we are getting into an improper situation. To accommodate the committee earlier, I answered a few questions, but now we are going into the substantive argument about Clause 30. Mr. Chairman said that I need not reply. I will deal with all of the aspects of clause 30 when we come to clause 30. Presently we are discussing clause 1 which deals with employment at special work sites or remote locations. I am ready to answer all of those questions. I will say to the hon. member for the last time, and I have said it over and over again, that under the scheme I proposed the night of the budget Quebec qualified for about \$40 million.