

Government Orders

(a) the total of all amounts each of which is the value of consideration that became due in the four calendar quarters immediately preceding the particular calendar quarter, or that was paid in those four calendar quarters without having become due, to the person or an associate of the person at the beginning of the particular calendar quarter for taxable supplies, other than supplies by way of sale of capital property of the person or of the associate, made by the person or the associate in the course of commercial activities does not exceed the total of

(b) \$30,000, and

I will not read paragraph (c). It is just as long as paragraph (a). Then in (2), there is an exception to that definition which is equally as long as the first part, including the part I did not read.

Now that is the lowest end of the scale on this tax. These are the people to whom it does not apply. How would you like to explain it to the people to whom it does apply? Good luck music teachers.

In the short time remaining to me I would like to raise a matter that I think is of very fundamental importance because I think there is some smoke and mirrors going on across the way on this issue. I raised this question yesterday. The Minister of Finance was good enough to come here for an hour yesterday, as the Minister of Justice said earlier, but not in order for us to debate with him. There was no opportunity for debate. He was here for us to ask questions. He was not here to give answers.

In fact, the House leader of the NDP got up at the conclusion of the exercise, if you can believe it, and said in a very pontifical way, "We appreciate the Minister of Finance making himself available for this hour to enter into this exchange. I think it has been helpful and useful". I do not think that the House leader of the NDP was even listening to what was going on, either that or he did not understand it.

I asked the Minister of Finance whether this was not the greatest single corporate tax decrease in the history of Canada. Did he answer it? No. No.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would not normally interrupt my hon. friend's speech. He had an odd good point in it. He referred to the House leader of the NDP and the fact that I drew attention to the fact that the Minister of Finance had stayed in the House an extra hour to respond to questions. That was one of the first opportunities we had, in a sustained way,

to not only question the Minister of Finance but to get him on record saying certain things. He said, for example, that he assumes that all of the savings that manufacturers will have when the manufacturer's tax is reduced from 13.5 per cent to 7 per cent will be automatically passed on. Of course, that is an assumption that he makes. I do not think there is a single other Canadian who makes that assumption. It was important to get the Minister of Finance clearly on record.

If I may while I am on my feet, it is clearly on record on a number of occasions that we have seen this co-operation, that the Liberals have actually supported the government's efforts to introduce the GST.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for Ottawa South on debate. There will be an opportunity for questions and comments within the next three minutes.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that we support the GST is so ridiculous as to fall of its own weight.

In the smoke and mirrors yesterday I would like to point out what I think to be a contradiction in what was said. The House leader of the NDP brought out the point that the minister tried to say to us that all of the manufacturers' sales tax is going to be passed on. That is what he said. He said that in answer to questions. But in his speech yesterday, as reported at page 7560 of *Hansard*, he stated:

In fact, about one-half of the \$18 billion in federal sales tax revenues currently comes from the taxation of business inputs, materials and supplies used in the production process.

He said that in the context that the savings of this business input tax was going to be available to broaden the capital investments in the country. He cannot have it both ways. Either it is available for business to invest or it goes through to consumers. The reality of this tax is that in a massive degree tax is being shifted from corporations to individuals, and that in the face of the minister's promises that corporations were going to bear a larger share of the tax burden in this country.

I do not know why the minister is not willing to be forthright on this. Twice the question; no answers. I challenge the government to come forward and say "Yes, we admit it. Because we believe in the corporate model, we think it is best that individuals pay tax and not corporations". Therefore we have, by the minister's own