

Adjournment Motion

the funds allocated for specific purposes, seems to me to ignore the fact completely that there are ten provinces in Canada and that an agreement was already reached with nine.

In the new constitution, which we will obviously be discussing soon, we should consider very carefully to what degree we want to allow the power of veto to prevent any further agreement or any further change. As I have mentioned before, the extreme is if that provincial power of veto is to extend to the province of Prince Edward Island, and I am not at the moment criticizing that province for any other reason than to say that it is a province that has a population smaller than the constituency which I represent. I think we have to think very carefully about our attitude toward a constitution that will completely stymie any future progress. I suggest that if we believe that we must at all times have the full agreement of the ten provinces, then we are in effect saying that at no time are we going to be able to have any future agreements between the provincial and federal governments.

Even the point about the distribution of the funds to the Quebec federal taxpayer being inequitable I find difficult to swallow, for the simple reason that the 2.4 million taxpayers in the province of Quebec cover almost all the families in Quebec. I suggest also that the \$85 which will go to every taxpayer is far more beneficial to those who are only paying \$100 or \$200 in federal sales taxes than would be the total of either the 8 per cent on furniture, shoes and clothing, or the 2 per cent across the board on the total purchases at that period of time.

What I am suggesting is that \$85 for every taxpayer is a fairer distribution than either the 8 per cent formula or the 2 per cent formula initially proposed by the Minister of Finance. Again I find it difficult to follow the logic of the argument that even if this \$85 per taxpayer is of benefit—and it is not intended to be a benefit—that it is inequitable.

I have one last point to make, and I see it is nearly five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

If the minister of finance of the province of Quebec is not prepared to deal his hand while Quebec is still part of Canada, then how is he going to deal with Canada under sovereignty association?

* * *

[Translation]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt)—Health and Welfare—Minister urged to consider ban on saccharin; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Supply and Services—Criteria used in calling for tenders; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr.

[Mr. Herbert.]

Orlikow)—External Affairs—Bell Canada contract with Saudi Arabia.

[English]

It being five o'clock p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills, notices of motions, public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, may I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to deal with the whole series of notices of motions for papers standing in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), starting with No. 7 and continuing to and including No. 43, since those motions are on the same subject, uranium cartel. I do not believe the hon. member would wish to come here every Thursday to deal with each one of them separately, and I think it is his wish that we proceed with all the motions together. I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to proceed in that order and that the other notices of motions preceding them be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Hon. members have heard the proposition put forward by the parliamentary secretary. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

● (1702)

DOCUMENTATION RESPECTING URANIUM CARTEL

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) moved motions:

No. 7.

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the letter dated September 1975 from Dr. O. J. C. Runnalls to Gulf Minerals Canada Ltd. advising them of the fourth quarter assessment of dues to SERU otherwise known in English as the Uranium Marketing Research Association or as the Uranium Club.

No. 8.

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the Department of Justice legal opinion referred to by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister on August 4, 1977 in the House of Commons touching on the uranium cartel.

No. 9.

That an order of the House do issue for copies of the quarterly reports prepared by Andre Petit of the Secretariat at SERU bearing on the uranium cartel.

No. 10.

That an order of the House do issue for copies of the minutes of all meetings at which Dr. O. J. C. Runnalls attended, bearing on the uranium cartel

No. 11.

That an order of the House do issue for copies of the minutes of all meetings at which Andre Petit attended bearing on the uranium cartel.