COMMONS DEBATES

March 28, 1988

S. O. 21

country you do not have to phone a very great distance before you start paying long distance charges.

I would like to point out a situation which pertains to some people in my riding. Entrepreneurs, in some cases, and people who choose to live in rural areas, in other cases, are now hit with a 10 per cent federal tax on the already very high rental rates that they pay for radio telephones. If you are a tourism entrepreneur on a lake 30 miles from Red Lake with no easy road access and, of course, no telephone line, in order to do your business you need to have a radio telephone. The rates for such a telephone range between \$50 and \$90 a month depending on the power of the transmitter and the service provided. Some of these people are suddenly being hit with a \$9 per month federal tax imposition on top of all their other expenses for what is essentially to them a local telephone service. That is an injustice which the Government should consider.

The telecommunication programming services tax, a tax on the people's entertainment in the form of cablevision, is another revenue raiser for the Government. The committee recommended a \$3 limit on the telecommunications tax in order to provide a measure of equity. That is something in which the Government is really not too interested and it ignored that.

Increasing the sales tax rate on paint and wallpaper from 8 per cent to 12 per cent is quite a substantial imposition on a particular portion of the population. It will, of course, affect the sales of do-it-yourself and home decorator stores. One wonders why.

The acceleration of remittances is another concealed revenue-raising measure. Before it came to power the Government made all sorts of vaunting promises to small businessmen about reduction of paperwork, reduction of bureaucratic compliance, and reduction of red tape. It is now prepared to put those people through the hoops of filling in returns on a weekly instead of bi-weekly basis and on a bi-weekly rather than monthly basis. I am sure that that is one sector of the economy which will not forget the way in which it has been inflicted upon by the Government.

I see, in the increase in the federal sales tax on beer, spirits, wine, and tobacco products from 15 to 18 per cent, that some of my more favourite vices, and some which I truly detest, are being hit in an equal fashion. I suppose that rather than making a specific confession I should point out that the Government has quite a range of legislative measures available to it if it really wishes to control and reduce the incidence of tobacco smoking.

Another tax put in for the purpose of revenue generation is the increase in the levy on air tickets. It must be pointed out that there are some benefits in the application of that levy, particularly for small, remote and isolated communities, and that it does not impact upon aircraft with a take-off weight of over 12,500 pounds. I am glad to see that exemption continued, and for this relief we give much thanks. However, I believe that we have increasingly a picture of taxation without representation whereby the Government continues to ignore many of the desires of the users of airports and airlines for whom, after all, it is a prime operating resource. That should be looked at very carefully.

The further increase on the excise tax on gasoline and aviation gasoline is already having distorting effects in this economy. Since the Government came to power it has increased the excise tax on gasoline no fewer than four times to the point that now one-tenth of the pump price of gasoline is made up, not of total taxes, not of total federal taxes or total provincial taxes even, but of Tory increases. Every time the average Canadian fills his or her average domestically or North American produced automobile they are paying \$2 in Tory increases alone for that fill-up.

Remote areas, of course, suffer from a lack of alternatives. We must recognize that by not taxing propane and by imposing lower taxes on diesel fuel the Government does provide alternatives. However, the people who use motor vehicles the most are the people who have the least opportunity to avoid the incredible imposition of those very same taxes.

I see that it is one o'clock, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to returning at three o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I call it one o'clock, the Hon. Member will have seven minutes left for debate plus the ten-minute question and comment period when we resume debate.

It being 1 p.m., I do now leave the Chair until 2 p.m. this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[English]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

A DEFENCE OF LANGUAGES COMMISSIONER

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a word in defence of Canada's Official Languages Commissioner, Mr. D'Iberville Fortier. He has been a strong and effective defender of the rights of Francophones outside Quebec. When one of the communities which I represent, Kapuskasing, Ontario, was locked in a struggle over official bilingualism, he was there to provide encouragement, support, and guidance. Thank you, sir, for that.

Now, because he expresses some concern for anglophone rights in Quebec, he is condemned and under attack. To all my