

*Business of the House*

hour ago or less, the government whip rose and proposed a request for unanimous consent to permit the submission of amendments to Bill C-78 in order that they might be submitted after the hour that is normally agreed upon. I do not want to arrive at ten o'clock without a decision having been made. I raise the matter realizing that this party, and perhaps the official opposition, might have amendments which they would otherwise not be able to put in. I wonder if we could seek an opinion from the government and from the official opposition in order to determine whether unanimous consent is being sought and is forthcoming.

**Mr. Turner:** Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was that we give leave to extend the deadline for giving notice of proposed amendments to Bill C-78 until 10 p.m. tonight for tomorrow's consideration, and until 5 p.m. Friday for consideration or later if necessary. Does the hon. House leader of the opposition agree?

● (2200)

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, as the deputy House leader of the official opposition stated, this was sprung upon us about 45 minutes ago. We cannot get in touch with our labour critic; we have tried. We do not know whether we have amendments. I asked the government whip in a brief conversation a few moments ago whether the government had amendments. He informed me that he did not know. It seems to me that it is not possible to give consent under those circumstances.

If I might comment upon the matter, it also seems to me, if the government considers Bill C-78 so all-fired important that it must be debated tomorrow in place of the allotted day, that it should have been ready with the bill. Obviously it is not, because it is requesting an extension of time. Under the circumstances I think that consent cannot be forthcoming, the matter having been sprung upon us, but I would suggest that tomorrow, after having allowed us time to get in touch with our labour critic, the matter might be raised again. If not, then some other order could be called tomorrow and we could proceed with the consideration of Bill C-78 on Monday.

**Mr. Smith:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to mislead the House leader of the Official Opposition. I should advise him that we have given notice of amendments.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The hon. member does not follow me. I know that because I inquired at the Table. Those amendments were filed, as is required by the Standing Orders, prior to six o'clock today. But when I asked the government whip whether the government had any further amendments, he told me that he did not know. That was the possible amendment area about which I was speaking.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### FINANCE—ADVANTAGES FOR QUEBEC RELATED TO NEW FISCAL TRANSFERS

**Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, on February 10, I asked a question of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussièrès) concerning fiscal transfers to Quebec and the gains or losses for this province in terms of the amounts that will accrue to Quebec. The minister confirmed certain figures very briefly. That is why I am asking this evening for further information concerning the impending war of figures, to all appearances, because since the federal-provincial conference, the PQ government, as usual, would have the people of Quebec believe that the federal government is to blame for all the economic ills and problems in Quebec. The PQ government had the media broadcast last weekend that the cabinet would meet in conclave to assess Quebec's financial position, because following the last federal-provincial conference, Quebec stands to lose, according to them, \$675 million. I am shocked, Mr. Speaker, at this attitude of the separatist government, which is trying to make the people forget its own mismanagement by passing the buck to the federal government and by saying: You have 74 Liberal Members of Parliament in Ottawa who do not protect your interests, who do nothing. It is the same old story that is being trotted out, this time about the fiscal transfers, and that is why I put the question to the minister on February 10.

Mr. Speaker, when I see all this, I am reminded of all the measures implemented by the separatist PQ government in Quebec, such as its very generous announcement on November 17 of an increase in the gasoline tax, because of which we, Quebecers, can now say we have the highest gasoline prices in Canada. This government also gave us a 16 per cent increase in electricity rates in January. It also took away from the farmers the letter N on their licence plates. It also allowed cutbacks for the drainage of farmland and the use of heavy machinery. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I refer to an article in the newspaper *La Presse* last fall against the right of Quebecers to be overtaxed. And then, the Quebec government tells us that it does not take part in federal-provincial conferences because it was isolated following a certain well-remembered constitutional conference. Following that article against the right of Quebecers to be overtaxed, we are told by the Quebec government that the province will lose \$675 million, even though that famous federal-provincial conference on the economy has not even been held yet, even though the figures quoted are those of last fall and even though the Quebec government taxes at a rate of 40.53 per cent a \$12,061 income.