

by a student, he came as close as he possibly could to suggesting that we should indeed amend the GST in much the same form as the amendment before the Senate this afternoon. I will not say that he went that far, but he inferred, in language strong enough to cause the student to accept his assurance, that following passage of the GST he would be giving the most serious consideration to the very subject of the amendment before us today. I am sure that many of the thousands of petitioners in British Columbia, and, indeed, across the rest of the country, will all feel that their petitions were not entirely in vain and that perhaps it was of some minor benefit to pursue this subject in the way they have so as to try to bludgeon some sense into the government on this issue.

They have obviously succeeded—not that they will succeed in persuading all of the members on the government side to support this amendment—in at least getting a moral commitment out of the Prime Minister that this subject matter will be dealt with following the implementation of the GST, if, indeed, it gets implemented.

Honourable senators, I have a second petition to table. It is dated September 27, 1990, and is signed by 25 people, all of whom, with one or two exceptions, are from the Lower Mainland. I see one signature from Kitchener, Ontario, but, as I have said, the rest are from the greater Vancouver area.

All of the other petitions deal with the same subject matter of the amendment presently before the Senate. I feel that these petitioners are entitled to have their petitions tabled prior to a vote being taken on this amendment.

The next petition again is in the same form and again deals with the imposition of the GST on magazines, books, newspapers and other periodicals. It is dated September 30, 1990. It contains 25 signatures of Canadian citizens, most of whom reside in the greater Vancouver area. A few, however, obviously were visiting at the time they signed. I see one from New Westminster, one from Shawnigan Lake, one from Campbell River, Vancouver Island, one from Ladner in the Fraser Valley and one from Delta.

The next petition I have is in similar form and also applies to the application of the tax to magazines, books, newspapers and other periodicals. It is dated October 1, 1990. Again, it is signed by the full complement provided for in the printed form; namely, 25 petitioners, most of whom are from the greater Vancouver area. I see that one is from Belleville, Ontario; one is from Victoria, British Columbia; one is from Whitehorse, in the Yukon, where I enjoyed living for a number of years; one is from Kamloops, B.C., and another is from Toronto, Ontario.

It is interesting that Canadians, even in the course of business travel or holidays, are still sufficiently concerned and sensitive to this particular aspect of the tax that they will take the trouble to sign a petition even away from their own homes. I would ask that this petition be tabled.

I might say, honourable senators, that these are not all of the petitions I have, but they were among the ones that I particularly noted dealt with the subject of the amendment

presently before the house. I thought it appropriate that these people should have their petitions presented before the vote is taken on the current amendment before the chamber.

The next petition is in the same form and is on the same subject matter as the previous ones; namely, the application of this tax to written materials, particularly school books. It is dated September 30, 1990. Again, these petitioners live for the most part in the Vancouver area. I note signatures from Abbotsford, Vancouver itself, McBride, B.C., some distance away, Langley and Toronto, Ontario.

● (1530)

I am referring only to some of the places other than greater Vancouver which are represented on this petition. All the rest are from Vancouver or suburbs of Vancouver and the greater Vancouver area. I would ask to table that petition.

Of the two remaining petitions I have to present, one is signed by 25 petitioners and is dated September 27, 1990. It is in the usual form and again deals with the same subject matter, which is the amendment presently before the Senate. Two petitioners are from Parksville on Vancouver Island, where my son-in-law and his wife live. Other petitioners are from Vancouver, Abbotsford, from UBC and Kitimat. Others are from Burnaby and West Vancouver.

The last petition I have on this particular subject is in the same form. It is dated September 27, 1990, and contains the signatures of 25 petitioners from the Greater Vancouver area, with the exception of Pitt Meadows, Aldergrove, one from Victoria and another from Surrey.

**Hon. Dalia Wood:** Honourable senators, I too have some petitions to table this afternoon. These petitioners come from my designated area as senator for the south shore of Montreal. The first petition comes from residents of Chateaugay and Huntingdon. These people have asked us to reject the new universal 7 per cent goods and services tax adopted by the Conservative government which will create serious and inhuman difficulties for Canadians.

They go on to say that the implementation of this tax will constitute an unprecedented assault on the income of Canadians, not only by forcing them to pay higher taxes but also by confronting them with a rise in inflation and unemployment. They have asked the honourable Senate to present these petitions. We all have designated areas in the province of Quebec, and I was pleased when I received these petitions from my own area. There is a total of 27 names on this petition.

*(Names of signatories read)*

I have another petition containing names of petitioners from Mount Bruno, which also adjoins my constituency. My constituency covers five federal constituencies. This petition also includes the names of several people from Noranda, which is a little further north of my area. These petitioners humbly ask the Senate to present their petition.

*(Names of signatories read)*