

Municipal Grants Act

tion. There are other parts of my constituency, however, whose municipality does not receive grants in lieu of taxes.

The exclusions under Schedule II are worth putting on the record. First, canal structures. What about Smiths Falls? Right in the middle of Smiths Falls there is a canal. Does the municipality derive any grant for that? It does not, because canal structures—falls and locks—are excluded. Second, conveyor belts, conveyance systems and so on; third, docks, wharves, piers, piles, dolphins, floats and so on, which are specifically mentioned in this motion, along with drydocks, gasoline pumps and gun butts; there is a range in my riding for practising. I am sure the municipality covering that area, which has been blocked off by the federal Government for that particular practice range, does not receive a grant in lieu of taxes.

The list goes on. It goes on to include monuments, penitentiary walls and fencing, pole lines, transmission lines, light standards and so on, reservoirs, storage tanks, roads, sidewalks, aircraft runways, snowsheds, tunnels, bridges, water mains and sewer mains. These are matters over which the municipality has some jurisdiction. The municipality cannot derive taxes from those works as if there were private houses built on them, for example. This is federal property. It has a purpose certainly, and there is provision in the law for grants to reach the municipalities in lieu of the taxes they might otherwise gather for these areas.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I question, as did my friend, the Hon. Member for Joliette, the Hon. Member raising this issue in the House when he could just as easily have raised it in caucus with even more success. He obviously had some television time in view. Therefore, I question the motives of the Hon. Member, although I do not question the substance of his motion. I believe we will not know, until just at the last moment before this debate runs out, whether this has been a planted motion—and it could be—or perhaps it is just an expression of frustration on the part of the Hon. Member who really wants to have this matter resolved for his own community. We will see if it is talked out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on the motion introduced by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde). First of all, I believe that everyone will agree that he should be congratulated for his excellent job in defending the interests of his constituents. In spite of what the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) said, I believe that without the support, effective work and devotion of the Hon. Member for Lévis, a contract of \$120 million for the CN Marine ferry would perhaps not have been granted as quickly as it was.

In addition, I do not agree with the Hon. Member for Joliette about the opinions expressed by my colleague for Lévis on Quebec Bill 38 because, just like the Hon. Member for Joliette, my colleague for Lévis is a Quebecer, and as the

representative of his constituents, he is entitled to oppose a motion or a Bill introduced by the Quebec Government which robs of job opportunities men and women in his constituency. Indeed, the City of Lévis is losing a grant of \$100,000 to create jobs in Lauzon. I therefore believe that my colleague must be congratulated. He was elected to protect the interests of his constituents and I think that he is doing a great job.

I also want to say that I do not understand the attitude of the NDP Members when they ask the Canadian Government to be a good citizen, which it already is,—and I know that for a fact—and when they say that Ottawa should pay property taxes like any other citizen. As for the Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, I do not understand them either. They formed the Government and did not introduce legislation in this regard, and in all the provinces with a Conservative or NDP Government, there are no policies as generous as those of the federal Government towards municipalities.

As for Quebec, having been a Member of the National Assembly in that province, I believe that it is important to recall that the Parti Québécois has exchanged one tax, namely property taxes, for the sales tax which used to belong to the municipalities. This means that the Quebec Government did not have to use supplementary funds to give to the municipalities. It simply took back the sales taxes paid to municipalities, and in exchange, it paid them what are called property taxes. On the other hand, the Quebec Government also makes exceptions to its own laws. I understand that the City of Montreal does not receive property taxes on the Olympic Stadium. Heaven knows that Montrealers have paid a lot of money for that stadium and not only Montrealers, but all Quebecers benefit from it. I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Joliette, who is losing control, was wrong to blame my colleague for doing his job.

Mr. La Salle: Do your own!

Mr. Malépart: Do not worry, I do my work. If my colleague who was minister during the short period when his party was in power had looked after the matter, it could perhaps have been implemented.

Mr. Speaker, more specifically about the motion, some of our colleagues have mentioned that the motion of the Hon. Member for Lévis deals only with one area or location. It should be pointed out that the exemption provided in the bill does not apply, as stated earlier, solely to the Lévis or Lauzon shipyard. It also refers to monuments, wharves, breakwaters, locks, drydocks, storage tanks, bridges, dams, walls, penitentiary gates, paving and production equipment since the provinces do not pay property taxes any more than the federal government does. It effectively restricts grants to lands and buildings.