

Time Allocation

the consideration of the report stage, and one sitting day to the consideration of third reading stage of the said bill; and

That, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Business on the final day for consideration of each such stage, both days, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this Order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose respectively of the report stage and third reading of the said bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise again and continue the debate we began last night on this issue. Last night the debate was becoming more than acrimonious. We saw the Minister of Finance negotiate with a gun called "closure" on the table. It earned the absolute ire and anger of all members. You quite rightly put everybody in place by reminding us that he is, after all, an honourable member. And as an hon. member he is being very appropriate in disseminating the truths—and there are many that come from his department and office—regarding the GST proposal.

He forgot to tell us that the start-up cost for the GST proposal is going to be in excess of \$1.1 billion, according to the Minister of National Revenue. He forgot to tell us that the operating costs for the implementation of this GST are going to be in excess of \$380 million annually. He forgot to tell us again that there are going to be an additional 3,900 other tax collectors required to implement this tax. He forgot as well to advise all members that the operating and administrative costs are going to be horrendous as the provinces and his own department are confused about how all of this will take place.

Mr. Speaker, you reminded us that the minister was an honourable man, so we continued to listen as he berated this side of the House for not coming up with alternatives. The minister said that his view was the only view because no one had presented an alternative. Again, he forgot to tell us that he and his party were elected to present policy proposals for our consideration. He did not give us an indication as to what proposals his department had rejected in place of the GST.

He forgot to take notice in Toronto just a few days ago that a group of economists, academics and journalists who write on economic matters presented a series of alternatives to the GST objectives by focusing on govern-

ment inefficient administration that, if corrected, would save in excess of \$13 billion per annum.

When the minister says that he must redress the tax situation in Canada in order to address these kinds of inefficiencies, why does he reject these rather worthwhile proposals by these individuals?

That is a good question. But you insist that he is an honourable man and we cannot impugn his honour. He forgot to tell us that the Institute for Research on Public Policy made a new alternative proposal to the GST, basing a new tax reform on income tax and an increase that would still be 10 points lower than it was in 1981. I do not know why that could not be considered an alternative tax to the GST.

Again, all members were silenced because, after all, the Minister of Finance speaks as an honourable man. He rejected with scorn and disdain another proposal presented by my hon. colleague from Broadview—Greenwood for a single tax. He says "No, no. That is but a simple book, a simple book that even my back-benchers over there cannot read". Yet, you insist, Mr. Speaker, that he is an honourable man and we must treat him with deference.

What are the objectives the Minister of Finance holds so dear that we must bow and scrape and I dare say grovel with deference, without being able to put across our views? The minister says we must have tax reform. Let us have tax reform.

Over the course of the last four or five years there has been an increase in personal taxes of some 24 per cent. There has been an increase of 62 per cent in personal taxes for low and middle income Canadians while at the same time only an 8 per cent increase for those in the upper income category.

This is the tax reform he would address with the GST. The minister forgot to tell us and his own members—except the two worthy hon. members from Alberta who have already rejected his entreaties—that there has been a decrease of some 4 per cent in the amount of taxes paid by corporations as a percentage of the GDP.

The minister forgot to tell us, even though his estimates pointed out that over the course of the middle 1980s, 1987 for example, businesses were to pay \$12 billion in corporate taxes but received \$9 billion in subsidies. The minister's tax proposal does not address