

where they may." I do not think the bureaucrats were paying attention to detail and I do not think the government was on top of the matter when it was introduced. I do not understand why we cannot take out the offensive parts of the legislation.

I could understand the government saying, "We did not know they were there." However, once you are made aware of these offensive measures, that someone in Toronto pays \$28 in GST whereas someone in Dawson pays \$193 to heat exactly the same house, why not remove that part. Just get it out of there. It does not seem complicated.

**Hon. Hartland de M. Molson:** I wonder if I might ask a question of Senator Lucier. I have listened to what he has had to say about the effect of the GST on the north country, and I cannot help but be in substantial agreement with what he has said about the problems there. I am interested in what is happening in the north country, and I am wondering if the problems he has just related to us could not have been raised in time for the Senate committee to do the job that it should have been doing, in my humble opinion, which was to have these amendments considered before the last minute. As matters have unfolded, these amendments can only be considered as a means of delaying the progress of the legislation. Senator Lucier would have received more support and interest had he persuaded the committee to bring in amendments to help relieve some of the situations he has described this evening. As I said in this chamber the other day, to wait until now to bring in amendments is to begin a process that cannot possibly work very well. We had time earlier, and had he raised these points for the committee to put forward amendments to correct them, perhaps they would have received a better hearing and a lot more sympathy, because we would have had more chance to understand and to participate.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Senator Lucier:** Senator Molson, that is an excellent question. I think you are trying to be fair and that you honestly believe what you have just said. However, there is one thing wrong with what you have said. These problems were raised before the Blenkarn Committee and the House of Commons by the government of the Northwest Territories and the government of the Yukon at the start of the process, and yet the provisions remain in the legislation. As far as the Senate Committee is concerned, I agree that it would have been nicer had we brought these issues forward sooner. However, I can tell you that these same problems were raised before the Blenkarn Committee and in the House of Commons at the beginning of this process, and there has not been one change. They have been rejected *holus bolus*. In fact, Mr. Blenkarn said at one point that if the government had been a little more open from the beginning, amendments may have been possible and some of these things could have been corrected.

**Senator Grafstein:** Mr. Blenkarn said that the government refused because the committee system was too partisan, that the government knew about these matters a year ago and refused to make amendments.

**Senator Molson:** I am talking to Senator Lucier.

[Senator Lucier.]

**Senator Lucier:** I simply want to say that the government knew of these problems more than a year ago.

**Senator Molson:** I just wish that our committee had brought these problems to this chamber. I quite understand what Senator Lucier has said, and I understand that the government is completely intransigent on the matter. However, that does not alter my opinion that when a Senate committee deals with something, it can report in any way it chooses, and if it finds inequities and so on, it should bring those forward to us. We cannot get at Mr. Blenkarn and we cannot deal with the problems here if they are introduced at the eleventh hour.

**Senator Olson:** Why not?

**Senator Austin:** An injustice is an injustice.

**Senator Lucier:** I guess the question is, why not? Why can we not deal with these problems now? In fact, would it not make more sense, in the face of a recession and in face of all the opposition, to delay the legislation for one year to make the proper adjustments?

**Hon. Efstathios William Barootes:** Honourable Senators, I would like to start out with one or two little observations. To borrow a phrase, it seems more than passing strange to me that this bill is so terrible, so poorly constructed, so flawed, so inoperable, so inoperative, such a jungle and so complex that it could not be changed and had to be rejected totally; that there was no other way, that it was unamendable. I am so pleased to see that there will be eight or more amendments introduced to patch up this thing.

**Senator Haidasz:** Then why don't you vote for the amendments?

**Senator Stanbury:** If you want amendments, you have them.

**Senator Doody:** One sentence and he has got you going already!

**Senator Austin:** We are competing for the "Simard Cup."

**Senator Barootes:** Senator Olson has remarked that these changes could have been brought in on September 24 or 25 if there had not been so many questions of privilege. On September 24 and 25 we were presented with the judgment that the bill had to be rejected.

**Senator Olson:** No, you weren't. You were presented with four possible options.

**Senator Barootes:** We did not have much of a chance to discuss the four options. As I recall, we were told very early in the committee meeting what was to be done.

**Senator Grafstein:** We were told that the government would not accept any amendments!

**Senator Barootes:** Majority ruled then, but, somehow or other, you do not seem to want to have the majority rule now. That is a rather unusual situation. I believe that the minority should have an opportunity to put its points forward, and we, as a minority, were not given any opportunity to put our views forward.