of the government Treasury at a hidden cost to the Canadian consumers. Its role is to regulate, not to print money. If the Government wanted to print money I think it should have stated that and perhaps changed the mandate of the CRTC.

If the Government sees this as a valid instrument to further reduce the deficit—which I agree must be addressed—through indirectly taxing large corporations, that is fine. The Government should openly state its intentions.

In his Budget Speech of May, 1985, the Minister of Finance announced the Government's intention to ensure that costs incurred by regulatory authorities were paid for by the regulated industries themselves. It is one thing for the Minister of Finance to recover the costs of regulation for the CRTC; it is quite another for the Government to enrich federal coffers and not the CRTC by introducing Bill C-4 without fully stating its case.

I have already pointed out that the CRTC is highly profitable and does not need to generate new sources of revenue. If it must redistribute those costs with respect to broadcasting and telecommunications, then I believe it is like comparing apples and oranges because the costs are different and their calculations are different. If, in reality, the intention of the Government is to raise revenues from new sources which will go directly toward the reduction of the federal deficit, why has it not come right out and said so? Instead, the Government has introduced Bill C-4 in the guise of generating new revenues for the CRTC to cover costs which are non-existent operating costs with respect to its over-all operation. It is another hidden method to enrich the Government's coffers without letting the population know exactly what it is doing.

If the Government wants to reduce its deficit, I repeat that there are other open methods which it could use. Incidentally, at whose costs will the non-existent deficit of the CRTC be reduced? Ultimately it will be the consumer because we are talking about television viewers, radio broadcast listeners and telephone subscribers when we are talking about regulating through the CRTC. As I listened to the Parliamentary Secretary lauding the Government's efforts in managing the economy and moving toward greater fiscal control, I could not help but stop to think about what is happening to Canadians in today's society and to their disposable income. If we consider the November statement of 1984 and the Budgets of May 1985 and February 1986, I think we will see a somewhat different picture emerge from that which the Parliamentary Secretary would have us believe. There are the increased federal taxes, the deindexation and the surtaxes and in the end the disposable income of many families, particularly those at the low and middle income range, is detrimentally affected.

• (1150)

I would like to give a few figures so that Hon. Members in the House and those who are listening can make some enlightened decisions for themselves. The tax measures introduced by the Government in the November 1984 Statement and the May 1985 and February 1986 Budgets, are affecting the personal income taxes of individuals in a considerable way, and reducing their purchasing capacity and their cash-in-pocket situation. We will have $570 million less to spend because of the modified indexation measures, that is, the 3 per cent reduction in the tax tables for everyone throughout Canada. A second example is the elimination in May of 1985 of the federal tax reduction. That will cost Canadians $490 million. A third example is the 5 per cent and 10 per cent surtaxes on our basic federal tax which was introduced in May of 1985. Because of those surtaxes, average consumers are being soaked an additional $550 million. When we consider the deductions which are now not allowed under the Registered Homeownership Savings Plan, we see an another $80 million which Canadians cannot put aside as a saving. The 3 per cent surtax on personal income tax, introduced in February of this year, has meant an additional $560 million which is not available and in circulation for the Canadian consumer.

When we consider the effects of sales taxes and excise taxes, some of which are visible and some of which are not, we see some rather staggering amounts which no longer are available to the Canadian consumer, particularly those in the low and middle income range, but obviously this affects all of us. The broadening of the sales tax base as a result of the 1986 Budget has meant that $510 million is no longer available to average Canadian consumers. The 1 per cent sales tax increase alone in May 1985 has meant $990 million is no longer available to us. The additional 1 per cent increase in sales tax which was introduced in February of this year has meant an additional $815 million cleverly soaked up, with very little political impact—although that will eventually happen—because it is virtually a hidden tax which no one can see at the moment of purchase.

The excise taxes of various kinds introduced in the Financial Statement of November 1984, and the Budgets of 1985 and 1986, amount to some $3 billion being taken out of the taxpayers' pockets. We can see from a personal income tax point of view that that is an incredible reduction of available cash.

The total cost of all this to low and middle income consumers is $2.695 billion. I would like to suggest that it is a very sad situation, indeed. Close to $3 billion is being taken out of our pockets. The move on the part of the Conservatives to implement something of what they call good social policy, such as the modification to the family package which includes the child tax credit, the child exemption and the family allowance, looks good on paper. It is going to cost $35 million in 1986-87. But it is really not as good as it would seem because it is a deindexation policy and changes thresholds so less and less people are going to have less and less money at their disposal.

The other issue is the increase in the RRSP limits. At this point it is at the $7,500 level but will be moving up to $15,500. That is very nice for those who can afford it. It will cost the Treasury $40 million this year.

With respect to the capital gains exemption, I think we have said plenty in this House about boats and so on, and how the