

route of a consumption tax? Look at what Neil Brooks is saying. He rids the corporate citizenship of this manufacturers' sales tax that they do not like. He rids our exports of the tax burden that we are told is robbing us of jobs, and it is also going to bring inflation, it is going to bring down the consumer price index by 2 per cent, which should allow or in fact induce the Governor of the Bank of Canada to bring down interest rates.

• (1100)

So why don't they want to do that? We have to ask this question. Why does this government opposite not want to follow a course that will bring down interest rates? Does anybody know? Can there be any explanation other than that government and the corporate citizens it represents, because they are the only ones it represents, like high interest rates because they have money to lend? Can any senator suggest a different course?

They keep asking about an alternative. I am giving you a very well calculated alternative based on the same figures they are using, produced by Neil Brooks, a great tax lawyer. Nobody has been able to sink his calculations. If they run out of arguments, all they do is say things like, "You are eating a piece of tangerine," or they scream "Be respectable." When they run out of arguments, they get on a high horse and try to be huffy and offended, but they cannot answer these important questions. Here is an alternative. You will raise the same amount of revenue. You will get rid of the ill-effects of the MST, and exports will no longer be burdened. The burden on the rich will be \$300 a year, which is nothing, absolutely nothing. Maybe I'm wrong because for the rich every penny counts. The burden on the rich would be \$300 a year and it would save the poor from having an extra burden placed upon them.

Why are they not accepting the Neil Brooks suggestion? They have not shot it down. The Department of Finance has not said that its calculations are wrong. The honourable senators opposite refuse to read it. Why do they refuse to read? It is because it does not go with their gut feeling that the way to do things is to soak the poor. They are afraid of a precedent which might increase, by a little, \$300 a year, the taxes of someone like Senator Poitras. Nothing! A mere flea bite! They are not prepared to do it. They do not want to adopt a solution that will decrease interest rates. They do not want to adopt a solution that would decrease the consumer price index by 2 percentage points. What would that do? It would help us get out of the recession faster. No doubt about it. It would keep us from getting into a new recession. It would give us a longer breathing space between recessions, because the majority of businesses in this country operate on a revolving loan, and when things go bad they have to shut down because they are always on the margin.

I recently built a house and I came to know a number of subcontractors. I used them and paid them for their services. I am devastated by the number of them who have gone under. My chief contractor and several of his subcontractors have gone under. These are people I have met. They are not

[Senator Gigantès.]

statistics. They are nice, good, honest workers who gave me excellent service. They have gone under. Why? Interest rates killed them. They are too high.

So, here is a solution that would reduce inflation by 2 percentage points, which would be a good inducement to reduce interest rates, if Mr. Crowe is telling the truth when he says he is keeping interest rates up because he wants to reduce inflation. But no, the Tories don't want to adopt this solution, even though it would only cost rich Tories, even rich Liberals, even rich New Democrats—and there are more of them than we think—\$300 extra a year to make life just a little bit easier for a Mrs. Parkhill who is going to have to reduce her food intake because she cannot reduce her rent, reduce the heat in her apartment in the winter, and not be able to buy that necessary pair of winter boots so she can get out. No, that is not to be. I don't know why I am wasting my time making such an argument to Tories.

Mrs. Brooks says:

A good deal of uncertainty surrounds the macroeconomic effects of introducing the GST.

The Tory government does not look at figures that in any way go against the holy precepts of Conservatism, which are essentially "Don't bug me, I'm well off. Accept. Tug your forelock, shut up, take lower wages, make maidservants out of your daughters, valets out of your sons. Lts's have servants and let's have the wages of domestics tax-deductible," as one of the senators opposite suggested to the astonishment of her colleagues on the Special Committee on Youth. Yes, one of your colleagues suggested that. What this country needs are more scullery maids, and not only should this country have more scullery maids but their wages should be tax-deductible. Part of the wages, about half the tax bracket of that particular senator, should be paid by the taxpayers in general. She can afford to pay a scullery maid on her own but, no, half of it must be paid by the taxpayer and, of course, through a consumption tax, part of the wages of that scullery maid will be paid, according to that senator, by the scullery maid. "Let us have more scullery maids. That is how to solve youth unemployment," says one of the honourable senators opposite to her colleagues on the Youth Committee.

Believe me, children don't want to be your servants; they don't want to be anybody's servants. They don't accept the corporate ethic of Monseigneur Castonguay who, when he runs out of arguments, lectures someone on this side about eating tangerines. Since when did he become an arbiter of etiquette?

You want the children of Canadian citizens to become scullery maids, and you want the tax system to pay for part of their wages. That is Tory heaven. That is what Tories think the country is all about; and if it is not the way they want it they will take their marbles and go and invest them in Mexico where workers are paid \$1.49 an hour. In their great stupidity they don't understand that a worker who is paid \$1.49 an hour cannot buy the product of the good corporate overlord who produces expensive products somewhere else. If they go on like