

business. Why are they not saying that that is a good amendment and that they are going to vote for it? No, they are not here talking about that either. All they are talking about is the negatives.

Another amendment that they could be talking about is the one that I have put, Motion No. 88, which talks about confectionery products and how we are trying to make the tax fairer. I put that amendment because I think it would be fairer for that particular sector of the economy.

Did opposition members put any of those amendments? Is there some sector of the economy that they are particularly concerned about and feel is being negatively affected by the GST? Where are their amendments? Their attitude is just to cancel the GST. We know the FST is falling apart, so what is left? Well I guess the deficit goes up.

That is the Liberal attitude on everything. The last time that party was in office, it took the deficit from zero to \$38 billion. That is the way it operates. If it had another chance, I would hazard to say it would take it from its current \$28 billion—and fortunately by the time it gets a chance we will have it down to \$15 billion—and run it right back up again.

I am happy to say that I am here in support of this legislation. I am a member of a government which has some policies, which has a direction, which has the interests of the Canadian people at heart, and which is making decisions which need to be made, unlike the government that preceded us which did not make any decisions that needed to be made. That government just made decisions which were popular.

Popular decisions are good at certain times of the year, until you have a \$38 billion deficit. Even at that point, that government was not prepared to deal with that decision.

I do not have any problem supporting this legislation. I do not have any problem supporting some of the amendments because they are wise, but unfortunately opposition members chose not to put any amendments that would enhance the legislation. They simply put amend-

ments which in their minds would cancel it. They do not suggest what else would happen.

I take it that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I could go on. I am sure I have convinced—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member of Okanagan—Shuswap.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I understand my comments are limited to two minutes because of a time restriction. Is that correct?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Two minutes.

Mr. MacWilliam: Jean Colbert, a 17th century French statesman, once said that the art of taxation consists of plucking the goose so as to obtain the most feathers with the least amount of hissing.

While this and previous governments have returned again and again to pluck yet a few more feathers, our Canadian goose has traditionally protested little. It would honk about and flap a little bit just to let the government know that it would not be taken for granted, but the protest was generally short-lived and soon forgotten, until now.

The government's proposed goods and services tax has changed all of that. The requisite honks of protest from our Canadian goose have turned into a terrified squall as it fights being throttled in the process of being plucked.

There is a fundamental change taking place across this land in response to this Tory tax tragedy. People from St. John's to Victoria are telling this government that enough is enough. They are angry and they are ready to take action. They are no longer willing to roll over and submit quietly to this government's repeated assaults upon Canadians.

In my very limited time I do not intend to stand here under any illusions that my brief comments will change this—

Mr. Speaker: It being 6.45 p.m., pursuant to the order made in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78, on Thursday, April 5, 1990, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 90.