

*Income Tax Act*

he is flexible, it seems to me that the questions confirm my side of the argument. However, I will try to state the reasons why I have reached that conclusion.

On the first point the minister asked, if I understood him correctly, how can the Quebec government seem to be flexible if they did not give a final answer until two days after the budget, and then it was a negative one. Well, surely, on a very complex measure like this when the government of Quebec believes—and constitutionally it is absolutely right—that this tax area is within provincial jurisdictional authority, and the province of Quebec almost above all others in our history has been very sensitive—and I would have thought that the minister would know that—to having control of areas within its jurisdiction, obviously it had to think, perhaps longer than the other provinces.

The minister is shaking his head, but they perhaps took longer in reaching a conclusion because they wanted to come up with a counter proposal that they thought, in terms of their priorities, was more reasonable. So, I turn it around to the minister. We have passed federal legislation where some parties have come later than others. If the minister was flexible, he would have looked at the essence of the Quebec government's proposal, not at its timing—whether it was two days later or whatever—and then decided whether it was good or bad. I do not accept the minister's implied argument there. If he was flexible he would have accepted it.

The second question was that he went back to the other ministers and asked them.

**An hon. Member:** Some.

**Mr. Broadbent:** He said some. I would like him to put it on the record as to which ones, but to me it is not relevant. They were all, within the federal constitution, autonomous within their domain. They had the right to accept or reject the federal government's proposal. As the minister knows, perhaps better than the rest of us because he dealt with it, he made flexible, different proposals to different provinces and they decided to accept. Why they did not think it agreeable to accept the Quebec government's alternative, I do not know. That is their decision. I say to the minister with all due respect, quite literally, it is none of their business. It has everything to do with the federal government's decision as it regards the government of the province of Quebec.

● (1602)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), I must put to the House the amendment moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent).

[*English*]

It is moved by Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):

That all the words after the word "That" be deleted and that the following words be substituted therefor:

[Mr. Broadbent.]

"Bill C-56 be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day one month hence."

● (1612)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, when I am free to do so, I take pleasure in reading the official report of the proceedings of this House in the early days of confederation, and I must say I am impressed by their seriousness. I trust that the generations to come will take as much pleasure in reading our proceedings as I have when I read those of a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, even though the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) has gone out for a few moments, I would like to congratulate him for the courage he demonstrated yesterday throughout his speech when he introduced his bill on second reading. I do not agree with all his points of view; however I must say he showed a lot of courage in arguing for his bill which is far from satisfying everybody, but at least he showed courage. He tried to convince hon. members of the House of the merits of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is always annoying for a member of the House to be required to take a position on an omnibus bill. We have seen that before, a bill containing many provisions, some good, some not so good and some quite bad. In order to accept the good ones, you have to accept the bad ones too. This is not really an omnibus bill; rather I would say semi-omnibus because it does have good points, but there is one which I am greatly dissatisfied with.

The bill before us today is not just a simple economic measure. Politically, it is the most consequential bill we have had since the beginning of the session, and perhaps even in the last few sessions. Of course the economic measures it contains are important and they should be debated. But any economic impact this bill might have is relegated to the background by the flagrant injustice Quebec will have to bear if this piece of legislation is passed. We of the Social Credit Party of Canada have always emphasized the significance of positive criticism in parliament. That is what I would like to continue to do with my colleagues. We should not let partisanship blind us to the point where we cannot see the good aspects of certain pieces of legislation. We should recognize that Bill C-56 does contain some good measures. Although not many, there are at least two which I would like to mention.

The one which pleases me most is the amendment dealing with capital gain exemption for farm corporations. My colleagues and I have long since been insisting on the need for such a measure. The government is finally introducing the necessary amendment, and I am sure that if it is adopted it will serve to protect our family farm corporations, a formula which is very popular these days.

I wanted also to comment on the political aspect of this bill. I am referring of course to the stand which the province of Quebec as a whole has taken against the federal Liberal party.