

This gentleman wrote:

Just raise the income tax rates enough to raise the necessary additional amount. Yes, I can hear the screams of indignant rage already, but raising the extra taxes through income taxes has certain advantages; the income tax system is already in place and will require no additional federal employees since it is largely assessed and remitted by taxpayers themselves. It has already been adjusted to reduce the burden on low income taxpayers and is directly apportioned to one's ability to pay.

That is a suggestion from a person within the riding of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

We are not without options. The finance committee minority report of the New Democratic Party has put forward some very good options to study a system that would be more suitable and fairer to all Canadians.

The first step would be to establish a royal commission, because for 25 years since the Carter commission we have not looked at the tax system in Canada and how it relates to the international market. That is what we should be looking at, not rushing headlong into some cockamamie idea this government has cooked up that because 48 other countries have it, it must be good and we should be using it. The reason that the government wants this goods and services tax is that it is a cash cow, an easy way to raise money.

The people of Canada know that even if this comes in at 7 per cent in 1991, if an election is held in 1992 and regardless of whether that party or the Liberal Party forms the government at that time, there will be an increase in the goods and services tax.

The only party that offers a proper alternative now or in 1992, I suggest, is the New Democratic Party. We have alternatives. We have set them out to the people of Canada in this minority report to the finance committee.

One of those alternatives in the short run, until we can get a full report of a royal commission, would be to roll back the manufacturers' sales tax which has apparently caused some hardships to our manufacturers and our exporters to 9 per cent, the 1984 rate that the Conservative government raised to 13.5 per cent.

Another would be to introduce a new refundable sales tax credit to compensate the poor for the burden that regressive consumption taxes have placed on them and to index the credit to the rate of inflation. It should be full indexation, not the partial indexation offered by this government. It is a regressive move. It continues the

Government Orders

regressivity and the oppression of the poverty stricken of this country, which we and the majority of Canadians find unacceptable.

We also suggest that a green tax be imposed to gain money to reward those who use proper and environmentally clean goods and services.

I suggest to the people of Canada that they look at the New Democratic Party's alternatives. The Minister of Finance has recognized that there are alternatives today. Although he said that he does not agree with them, I think he should study them a little more carefully.

Let us be clear about what this House is debating. The government has moved that we agree in principle to a goods and services tax. The Liberals have amended that suggestion and proposed that we do not do it now but do it in six months' time.

In six months there will be a new Liberal leader and that party may have decided what is its policy. My guess is that the corporate backers of the Liberal Party and the corporate bag men of the various candidates will persuade the Liberals to accept the goods and services tax just like they now accept the trade deal.

The New Democrats want to kill the GST. In a few minutes I will move a motion which could do exactly that. I move pursuant to Standing Order 60:

That this House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division: