

because they do not understand that the two go hand in hand.

We have 80 members on this side of the House who want to be heard in this debate. I do not know what is wrong with members to your right, Mr. Speaker, that they do not want to take the opportunity afforded to them in this House to explain to their constituents what the GST is all about. However, to ensure that members of the Liberal party can be heard in this House, I move:

That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of Bill C-62.

I believe it is important that parliamentarians be heard on the question of the goods and services tax in this country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The House has heard the terms of the motion moved by the hon. member. Would those members who object to the motion please rise in their places?

And more than 15 members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Hockin: Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct some very serious faults that have been made in the last two speeches by Liberal members. I am astonished to hear two falsehoods which Liberal party members should be very aware are serious misconceptions that they are propagating. They have been propagating them steadily for the last three months and have just tried to do it in the House again.

The hon. member for Nepean said that municipal libraries will have to pay the sales tax on books. That is not true and she knows that.

Second, the finance critic for the Liberal party just spoke about tourism and the GST and made an absolutely inaccurate statement. He said that the Tourism Association of Canada does not support the GST. Yes it does. It wants a lower rate but it supports the tax conceptually. That is what the hon. member does not want to hear because we have an alternative and the opposition does not have an alternative. The argument is about the rate, not about the tax. I would ask him to clarify what he means when he says the association does not support the tax conceptually.

Government Orders

Also, the hon. member who serves as the finance critic for the Liberal party talks about fiscal reform. Since 1984 this government has spent 3.5 per cent on average on program increases every year. I would like him to tell me what fiscal leadership the Liberal governments in the 1970s showed and how much their increases were year by year. I do know that from 1972 to 1975, when the member for Vancouver Quadra was the finance minister, increases were over 17 per cent a year. The member talks about fiscal reform. Fiscal reform has been pursued by this government. The previous Liberal government did not pursue fiscal reform or tax reform.

Finally, I want to ask the member what he means when he talks about the 1984 level of the federal sales tax and the manufacturers' sales tax. He fails to tell the House that in that year the Government of Canada was going to run a deficit of \$38 billion or higher. That is the kind of fiscal reform he wants to return to.

Mr. Young (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, first of all, in terms of the tourism industry, if the hon. minister wants to discuss the question of the GST with the tourism industry I can arrange for that very easily. As a matter of fact, on Wednesday evening of last week the Canadian Restaurant and Food Association, a very integral component of the tourism industry in this country, was here. It said that it, like many other people, are very concerned with the government's approach on the goods and services tax. It is not like saying: "Are you in favour of fresh air? Are you in favour of it or are you against it?" It is not that black and white. The restaurant association does not support the proposal that the government is trying to ramrod through this House. It does not, and that is a fact. The Nova Scotia tourist association, also represented at that dinner, refused to support the government initiative as it is presently before this House.

Sir John A. Macdonald supported some things in this country too, if we want to go back. He supported the railway. What is the minister's position on the railroad in this country now?

The Liberal government of the 1970s and early 1980s had a mandate and it at that time had to answer to the people for what the people decided was not the proper way to proceed in this country. I am not going to defend what went on in 1970 or 1980, not at all. I have no need to.