

three years is an unacceptable proposal. Taxpayers know about their own situation and they should attend to their files. But on the other hand, you will understand that in the case of the Department of Revenue, there are millions of applications submitted each year, and it must be realized that the federal Department of Revenue cannot be expected to examine and scrutinize, within two or three months, or two years for that matter, everything in terms of applications and returns from taxpayers. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the four-year period is needed for sound management, so that representatives of the federal Department of Revenue can make the required inquiries and verifications with taxpayers.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question is on Motion No. 14, which has been moved by Mr. Orlikow for Mr. de Jong. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In my opinion, the nays have it.

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to Standing Order 81(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

● (1240)

**Mr. David Orlikow (for Mr. de Jong) moved:**

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-80, be amended in Clause 51 by striking out lines 15 to 28 at page 111.

He said: Mr. Speaker, until now fruit beverages that contain less than 25 per cent fruit juices have been exempted from this taxation. We are told by manufacturers that many of the powered fruit beverages such as Tang are used primarily by those people living in remote areas of Canada who do not have access to a wide range of products or to fresh and frozen fruit juices, as well as by families with low incomes. To apply the excise tax to these products would simply add to the cost of living of such people. They are the ones who need the protection. They find it necessary to use this type of product and

### *Excise Tax Act*

cannot afford the increased cost that will be imposed upon them by this tax. It is for that reason that I have moved this motion.

**Mr. John Parry (Kenora-Rainy River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favour of the amendment. I am glad to see that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Crombie) is present in the House at this time. The proposed exemption would significantly affect a large number of the people he is mandated to serve and whose interests he is charged with protecting.

For example, in my riding there are some 30 communities which cannot be reached by road and are totally dependent on air travel for all the goods coming to their communities. These people have to pay very high prices for anything which comes into their communities in liquid form.

If I might disregard for 30 seconds the rule of relevance, I would like to use the example of gasoline. In some communities in my constituency it does not sell for 55 cents, 60 cents or 65 cents per litre, which so rightly caused complaint in southern areas of Canada. Rather, it sells for prices ranging from \$1 per litre to \$1.80 per litre. That is approximately three times the price of gasoline in southern Canada. We see similar examples of price differential caused by air freight when we look at consumable liquids such as juices, fluid milk, pop and other fruit beverages. It is for that reason that I should very much like to see the House pass this amendment.

There are many communities in my riding where Tang is a staple. It is a staple to a greater degree than orange juice is a staple to those who are fortunate enough to be able to purchase a can of orange juice or a can of frozen orange juice at a price of \$1.39 to \$1.49. If these people had to purchase the same can, they would be paying something in the order of \$3 to \$4. This is no exaggeration. Those cans are not sold in northern communities because they are frankly unaffordable to the people who would buy them.

This is something that has implications. Of course we know the implications of a tax on this sort of food. It is a food, no matter how much some of us may ignore its presence in the market-place. I do not drink Tang except when it is the only alternative, but Tang and its commercial clones are fulfilling a very valuable role in northern Canada for people who do not have any access, particularly during the winter, to fresh fruit, vegetables or fresh juice in its fluid form. If the excise duty of 9 per cent is put on these beverages, we will see an increase, not in the order of one cent, two cents or three cents per package. When it gets to northern communities and because of freight costs, even on dry goods, we will see an increase in the package price of something in the order of 10 cents to 15 cents. That will not represent gouging; it will just represent those people in the transportation and distributing cycles taking their mark-up on the price which will have been inflated by the imposition of this tax.

I should also like to point out the position of low-income families in southern Canada. It is my belief that Tang is a popular product with those people. Very often it is used as a