

we will not fall over and play dead; not on your life, Mr. Speaker. There is one of them now. I am going to move that that hon. gentleman's salary be reduced to two cents, and that is twice what I think he is worth.

● (2120)

If I may get back to federal-provincial relations—I am not in good form tonight, having risen at six o'clock this morning to catch a flight for Ottawa—I shall return to my main theme. I shall deal with my other theme tomorrow afternoon, hopefully. For the present I want to tell the House of other examples of bullying tactics, of dragooning, of Upper Canadian bullyboy behaviour.

Mr. Abbott: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) had better watch out. If he ever comes down to Newfoundland he will find out what consumers can be like.

Mr. McKenzie: He'll be consumed.

Mr. Crosbie: The federal government agreed with the provinces on a program called revenue stabilization, that is, the federal government guaranteed that a province's total net revenue would not be less than its net revenue in the immediately preceding two years if the rates and structures of its taxes were to remain unchanged during those two years. That was the revenue guarantee.

That guarantee was most helpful for the financially less well endowed provinces, because they could go to the bond markets more easily. When you went down to the States and mentioned a revenue guarantee, it sounded good. People down there knew that the federal government's revenue guarantee meant that a province's revenues would not slip back, that is to say, if they did slip back from the level of the previous year, the federal government would make up the difference. The federal government never had to pay one cent under that principle. It never cost it one cent, one sou, one copper. It cost the government nothing to agree on that principle with the provinces; but it helped provinces like Newfoundland when they became involved in the financial markets. The guarantee provided fiscal stability.

What did the federal government do with our revenue stabilization program? While the negotiations were going on to establish the principles embodied in this bill, the federal government came to the provinces and said, "We want to do away with revenue stabilization. We no longer want to implement that policy." In other words, it was another twist of the arm. The Minister of Finance had the poor old provinces by the arm, and he gave it another twist, as much as to say that if they did not behave, if they did not accept what he was offering, they were going to be hurt even more. The federal government said that revenue stabilization was to go by the board, although the program was not costing it one cent.

Some members of cabinet might realize the dirty struggle which was going on, and I hope they are listening.

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements

Mr. Paproski: Listen, Gillespie, and you may learn something.

Mr. Crosbie: I hope they are either listening or that they will read *Hansard*. What the government did was another example of its attitude to federal-provincial relations. Given all this, some of you may wonder why the ten provinces were able to get together and make a joint proposal last December 7. They did it because they wanted to save themselves. For the first time in federal-provincial relations, the ten provinces agreed together, on all of these—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Does the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) have unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) may continue. Order, please. I see the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) rising on a point of order.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said no.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. The hon. member cannot rise on that point of order after Your Honour has recognized the hon. member for St. John's West. (Mr. Crosbie).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): That is a valid point of order. I had recognized the hon. member for St. John's West.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I will only take a minute or two.

Mr. Stollery: Mr. Speaker, I also rise on a point of order. I also said no, and I am sure I said no before Your Honour recognized the hon. member for St. John's West.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. It is possible that I did not hear. I shall ask again. Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I could not hear the sense of the House; therefore I shall ask again. Is there unanimous