

Lévis. The legislation excluded the dry docks two years ago, nearly three years ago. The Hon. Member for Lévis is a Government Member, so let it be known to the people of the constituency of Lévis that we of the Progressive Conservative Party, are not preventing the City of Lévis from receiving increased taxes. Therefore, I say right now, on behalf of my party, that we are not going to prevent the City of Lauzon from collecting extra taxes in respect of federal facilities that seem to have been ignored or excluded in good faith.

An Hon. Member: This was agreed upon unanimously.

Mr. La Salle: It was agreed upon unanimously, but the dry docks are not included in the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please! The Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) has the floor. He should not be interrupted.

Mr. La Salle: You are absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. I did listen religiously and respectfully when the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) was speaking. Yes, I listened to him. He is asking his Government, which means—and it is important that the voters in Lévis should know about it—that for the past three years, he has been, I would assume, making representations to this Minister, the Ministers involved, the Cabinet, but to no avail, so today he has to resort to this procedure which enables us to put forward motions and proposals under the heading of Private Bills. Has the Hon. Member for Lévis failed to influence his own Government into supporting such a change? If his Minister were to come in this House and introduce such a measure, we would say yes, the same way we are saying yes today to the Hon. Member for Lévis. But the Hon. Member for Lévis knows one thing, and this is important and rather sly in this case, as I say, the Hon. Member for Lévis knows one thing: he is going to make his point, he is going to take this opportunity to blame the Quebec Government for not being as good a citizen as the Canadian Government. This is not very relevant to the principle he is advocating today. One thing he knows, there is a good chance that his own colleagues will kill his motion today by talking it out in the House of Commons. You know the system.

So the Hon. Member for Lévis would very much like to tell his constituents: I asked very strongly for extra taxes for the City of Lévis, but the House of Commons said no. It will not be the House of Commons, it will be his own Government who will block that, his colleagues with whom he has been working for some years now. And that is important, for the House should not mislead the people of the Lévis riding, or of any riding for that matter. We know the system. Indeed we do share the concerns of the Hon. Member for Lévis, and we want the city of Lauzon as well as other municipalities with similar or identical facilities to receive additional taxes, I mean, grants. However, we are quite aware that this is not the best way to raise this issue. We, the opposition have no other choice

Municipal Grants Act

when the government is adamant than introducing private bills to let the public know that we really want the government to heed our proposals. Although he would not admit it, the Hon. Member for Lévis knows that he will have to confess to his constituents his miserable failure at his own caucus and before the Cabinet. He is moving this motion in the House today to convince his constituents that he strongly and honestly defends their position, knowing as well as I do—dare I be presumptuous too—that his own colleagues will kill his motion. I should like his Lévis constituents to know that the Progressive Conservative Party supports the principle he has put forward. The Liberal Party alone will have to assume the responsibility for denying the request of the Hon. Member who knew what was coming the very moment he stood up in the House today, Mr. Speaker.

So, we support his motion. We understand his strategy, and hope that the Government will be in favour of grants in lieu of the taxes which the Government of Canada is paying on its properties in various municipalities throughout Canada. Once again, I want to speak for those municipalities which are in the same situation as Lauzon, and I would be most pleased if the Government's answer was positive, but I have grave doubts on that score. I want to say at the outset that we on this side, Mr. Speaker—and I will not go any further, but I could not sit down without upbraiding the Hon. Member for Lévis for playing petty politics at the expense of the Quebec provincial Government about a matter which is essentially a federal one and for neglecting to make a distinction between grants which are a kind of federal tax payable to municipalities and grants which may be paid to municipalities under programs established by the federal Government in the area of job creation, industrial incentives or development. There is quite a difference! One should not mix up apples and oranges, Mr. Speaker, either in this Parliament or elsewhere.

The question under consideration today concerns the federal Government. The Quebec Government has nothing whatsoever to do with it. It is not involved. However, has the federal Government carried out its duty? Does the federal Government meet the qualification of good citizen mentioned a moment ago by the Hon. Member for Lévis? If that is not the case, if the federal Government is considered a bad citizen by the Hon. Member for Lévis, then the Hon. Member should do his duty by bringing pressure to bear on his colleagues who are in office for the time being. As for us, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, in a few months down the road we will be able to prove that the federal Government behaves as a good citizen towards every municipality in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to enter this debate. The Private Member's motion which is before us today is a good motion even though it is very limited in its impact other than within