

are throwing more light over the matter than the other parties and, besides, that we do not stop there. People will sometimes say: Only the poor people support the Social Credit party. In fact, our supporters are not solely the poor people, but poor people who understand most readily since somebody who is made to understand through his wallet is liable to keep his ears wide open.

It is a long time since people have been suffering from insufficient incomes. Despite every and all government assistance programs, commissions and committees are being formed to inquire into the economic situation in Canada and submit reports. The Economic Council of Canada as well as the special Senate committee on poverty have tabled their reports in which they state that there is inequity in terms of distribution of wealth. If such inequity exists, the problem cannot be solved by hiding it, but by coming out into the open.

This is why I refer to those loans Quebec has obtained. I do not object to Quebec obtaining assistance, on the contrary. But if, instead of borrowing money to lend afterwards and hasten the process of indebtedness, we would use the services of the Bank of Canada to finance the public sector, to cash in on our credit in order to enjoy the outcome of our labor and that of all Canadians, then we would have been of service to the people at large.

Mr. Speaker, Quebec will have reimbursed in 20 years, \$97 million in interests, excluding the initial loan of \$65,900,000, making a total of \$163 million. This is a deadend situation. I am mentioning this example just to emphasize that if Bill C-8 might improve the situation, it does not deal with the heart of the matter. I appreciate these are provisionnal arrangements concluded for a limited period of time. I know all that, but the fact remains, however, that while we will be living through these temporary arrangements for five years, we should strive in this House to devise the effective means that are conducive to the development of all regions of the country.

There are now three provinces which are not entitled to equalization payments. Those three provinces have to give money to the others to contribute to their development. I understand that we live in a confederative system and that the federal government has a responsibility to distribute as equitably as possible the nation's wealth. But there can be differences of opinion on the means to an end, and I think that if we established as soon as possible an income security system, each Canadian citizen would be assured of a minimum income, which would allow provinces to levy taxes from their citizens and to administer themselves under their own powers.

This is how I see things, and for this reason I wanted to make my views known so that everybody would realize that we are in good faith, just as much as any other member, when we discuss those problems. Only, we want the population to be as well-informed as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we could of course go into a lengthy discussion on education, but we have to recognize that until we change the constitution, the provinces have jurisdiction in this matter. So let us leave to them their sources of revenue in order that they may carry out their responsibilities. If the federal government needs more money to govern Canada efficiently, plain common sense dictates

#### *Federal-Provincial Arrangements Act*

that the solution we are proposing, which is certainly not perfect but is just as valid as any other, be considered.

• (1530)

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** By unanimous consent the hon. member has been allowed to make his contribution, although the question had already been put. In order to follow the proper order, the question will be put again. It is moved by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) that Bill C-8, to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the established programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be read a third time.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

#### INCOME TAX ACT

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-169, to amend the Income Tax Act, be read the second time and referred to Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This motion, in its terms, is similar to or as a matter of fact identical with, one that was placed on the order paper in December of 1971 following the so-called mini-budget presented by the Minister of Finance on the night of October 14 during the adjournment proceedings of the House under Standing Order 26. There were two Notices of Motions of Ways and Means put forward on October 17. One only was proceeded with. The one presently before us appeared in *Votes and Proceedings* under date of February 22. Incidentally, and strangely enough, the entry under *Votes and Proceedings* does not indicate what type of motion or through which part the minister was trying to present the motion to the House. There was no indication whether it was being done under Standing Order 60 (1) or 41(2).

I notice, however, that in *Hansard* the appropriate wording has been put in the minister's mouth. The first point I wish to make is that the notice in *Votes and Proceedings* should be corrected. This was not done. Secondly, I would put to you that this is the first time we have had this sort of recurrence from one session of Parliament to another of a budgetary provision. I say "budgetary provision" in that it is a tax measure. There had been no prior consideration of this point because the new rules did not come in until prior to the 1970 session. So, we are in a position of *de nova*.

I want to ask Your Honour and all members, whether this method of proceeding was contemplated by the House when it adopted Standing Order 60. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is an area which you have so felicitously described as one of those to which the committee on procedure should turn its attention. I would say