

Finance

[Translation]

MANPOWER

POSSIBILITY OF INCREASING FUNDS FOR LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to discuss a matter of extreme urgency which requires immediate attention.

In light of the recent publication of unemployment statistics which particularly affect Quebec, and since we are now in the process of choosing local initiatives programs related to this project, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That the budgets earmarked for local initiatives programs be increased immediately in line with the higher unemployment rate, particularly in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion, therefore, cannot be put.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED DEDUCTIBILITY FROM INCOME TAX OF MORTGAGE INTEREST ON SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

If Canadians who want to buy a house find it increasingly more difficult to do so, it is in part because of the rising prices of houses, but mainly because of the high interest rates on mortgage loans. Since the steps taken by the government have completely failed in this area, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin):

That the House direct the Minister of Finance to come up with a policy which would allow owners of single family dwellings to deduct from their taxable income the amounts paid in interest on their mortgage loans. Such a policy would make it possible for low and middle income Canadians to buy a house, so as to live decently.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

● (1410)

[English]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—POSITION OF QUEBEC ON CONSTITUTIONALITY AND POSSIBILITY OF PROVINCIAL PROGRAM

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister with regard to the constitutional position of the government respecting its restraint program and the report in the press that the government of the province of Quebec plans to introduce legislation to establish its own system of control of prices and incomes in that province. Has the Prime Minister received any positive assurance from the premier of Quebec that he accepts the constitutional position adopted by the Prime Minister of Canada and expounded in this House in that regard?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered a similar question in the House a couple of days ago and indicated that the constitutional problem had been raised at the meeting I had with provincial premiers. They indicated interest in knowing if we had examined the constitutional aspects of it. I indicated to them that we had and we were confident that the bill, as it is drafted, is within the constitutional power of the government of Canada.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the premier of the province of Quebec indicated that he accepts the constitutional position outlined by the Prime Minister of Canada, and can the Prime Minister confirm or deny that the government of the province of Quebec does intend to establish its own system or its own program of controlling prices and incomes within that province?

Mr. Trudeau: On the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, the premiers expressed various opinions on my statement about the constitutionality. None of them rejected our claim that we would have a bill which was clearly constitutional. Of course, they had not seen the bill by then so they reserved judgment until they had seen it. None of the premiers indicated that they were challenging or even questioning the right the federal government had to do what they themselves, the premiers, had urged us on at least two previous occasions—at the interprovincial meeting of St. John's and the other interprovincial meeting of premiers at Toronto the year before—when they urged the federal government to take strong leadership in the fight against inflation. I think the discussion I had at the meeting with them indicated that they were generally happy that we are taking leadership. They wanted to examine the bill and project in more detail.

On the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I have no information as to the course the Quebec government will follow. Mr. Bourassa has spoken to me since the Monday meeting indicating he was examining various ways by which they could co-operate with the federal government in enforcing our strong anti-inflation stand.