

Government Orders

Ms. Langan: They listened to the Liberals one time and as you well know, Mr. Speaker, there is not a Liberal party in British Columbia so they have a choice of the Reform party or the Christian Heritage party. People who have long supported the Tory party have said "enough is enough".

Small business people in my riding are saying: "Would you please convey to the House of Commons that we work very hard in our small businesses, and we struggle very hard". They are facing increased taxation on things like gas, fuel, supplies, our employees' uniforms, all of those things that add to the burden and of the small margin which makes it impossible for a business to work. I have a daughter who is a young restaurateur in the riding next to mine. She is struggling.

• (1620)

She is a free enterpriser and she is struggling.

Mr. Epp: Good grief, a free enterpriser!

Ms. Langan: She is a free enterpriser.

Mr. Epp: She will vote Tory next time.

Ms. Langan: My daughter will never vote Tory. My daughter is a socialist with a conscience. She will be a rich socialist with a conscience. I have no problem with that.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Langan: We have too few of them to put you folks in your place.

An Hon. Member: Unlike them, she will be willing to pay her taxes.

Ms. Langan: She does not mind paying her taxes as long as they are fair taxes.

She is struggling to begin and get established in this small business. Every time she turns around there is a new tax. She said: "I wouldn't mind paying those taxes, if General Motors was paying its share, if the big business community was paying its share, if the Royal Bank that I have a loan with is paying its share, I would not mind a bit."

This is a young woman and she will be prepared when she is rich to pay her share. She believes now that they should also pay their share.

I would like to conclude by going back to my opening remarks. It is that 1.5 million children in this country live in poverty. I am getting mighty tired of hearing the hon. members from the other side of the House bleat about

how many jobs they have created when that many children in this country are hungry.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I would not have participated at this stage of the debate had it not been for the speech from the Hon. Member for Calgary West who tried to suggest in the course of his remarks that somehow the defeat of this bill would return us to the bad old days of 1972 to 1984.

Those days today seem like Halcyon days compared to what Canadians had to endure since 1984 with the present administration and its incompetent management of the economy of this country. Indeed, I would like to look at the facts that the Hon. Member for Calgary Northeast pointed out in his speech this morning. He claimed that the deficit in 1984-85 was \$38 billion. Anyone would think that if you are going to reduce a deficit, you would increase taxes.

There are two ways of going about it. You can either increase taxes or reduce expenditures. This government, with great trumpeting and fanfare, says that it is doing both. It increased taxes all right. It increased taxes by \$42 billion. Any reasonable person would think that if you have increased taxes by \$42 billion, you must have rid yourself of the deficit. Has the deficit gone down? It has gone down only to \$30 billion.

If the government has increased the taxes \$42 billion, one would think that the deficit would have gone down. But it stayed very large.

The government has doubled the national debt in four years of incompetent mismanagement. The member says that Canadians do not want to go back to the bad old days, 1972 to 1984. Canadians are crying out for the bad old days compared to what they are getting from this government with its VIA Rail cuts and that sort of thing.

Let me speak to the amendment that is before the House. I want to clarify one thing. The motion that has been moved by the Hon. Member for Edmonton East on behalf of the Hon. Member for Yukon deals with two amendments to the proposed bill before us.

The amendments delete the 13.5 per cent rate from the bill. The hon. member does not seek to delete the new 19 per cent tax on wines and the new 9 per cent tax on building materials. I would have thought that the Hon. Member for Kamloops whose riding I am sure depends heavily on the forest industry and the manufacture of building materials would have opposed this 9 per cent tax. Yet, the amendment proposed by the Hon.