

explanation to the numbers. For instance, we give tax breaks to big companies and tax deferrals, probably in the order of \$35 billion. I think we should get that money back because we have a debt. It should be paid for. So I have some problem with his numbers. I would like him to comment on how the debt can be doubled in five years and at the same time say we did the proper thing was done. When the Conservatives took over, the over-all—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Could I ask the Member to conclude, please, as the time is running out?

**Mr. Kindy:** In 1985, the total expenses of the Government were \$109 billion. They are projected to be \$142 billion. That is an increase of over \$33 billion. I do not call that cutting the deficit and the debt. I would like him to comment on that.

• (1540)

**Mr. Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member says that we have not cut enough and he has a problem with the numbers. He points to the fact that the debt, he says, has increased during the last five years, and no one is disputing that. But if the Hon. Member cares to look at the figures, at the expenditures of the Government and at how much money goes to service that debt, there is the problem we face.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Cut.

**Mr. Valcourt:** The Liberals say cut, but every time a cut is proposed they yell for more money. We know and Canadians know from coast to coast that you cannot trust the Liberals to cut any deficit but you can trust the Liberals to mortgage the future of the kids of this country.

**An Hon. Member:** They did it.

**Mr. Valcourt:** To come back to the Hon. Member from Calgary Northeast, who says there are not enough cuts, my own view on this Budget is that it is well balanced because of the regions of Canada. It is all right to say that we should have cut more, but if you look at the balance, these are serious cuts that will take effect on the fiscal framework over the next five years. The deficit will be cut by half by 1992-93 and that is, I think, serious

*The Budget—Ms. McLaughlin*

progress in the right direction. The purpose of this, as the Minister of Finance has indicated time and time again, is to allow the growth in Canada to continue to ensure that we can generate enough revenues to pay the interest on the debt and also to afford needed programs for Canadians from coast to coast.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the motion that the House approves the budgetary policy of this Government. I will be speaking against that motion because I do not think that middle income and low income earners in Canada would support this motion on this budgetary policy. I think they would say no to this budgetary policy. The homeless of this country would say no to this budgetary policy. The one in six children who are living in poverty would say no to this budgetary policy. Those who are unemployed and who see the Minister projecting that 8.2 per cent unemployment in this country for this year is an acceptable level would say no to this budgetary policy.

This is what has led to a lack of trust in all the policies of the Government and, in particular, this Budget. When taxpayers look at what is happening and see that in 1985 a family whose assets are valued \$6.2 billion received a \$500 million tax break, they do not have much trust in the Canadian Government and its policies.

Since 1984, the budgetary policies of this Government have meant that corporate taxes have increased by eight per cent, personal income tax by 45 per cent and sales tax by 67 per cent. I do not support this budgetary policy and I believe that Canadians do not support this budgetary policy.

I would like to speak particularly to some issues in this Budget having to do with northern Canada, those areas that are more remote and, as a consequence of this Budget, will experience even more severely the effects of it. This refers not only to northern areas like my own, the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, but also to many rural parts of Canada.

Let me outline just a few issues to illustrate why it would be impossible to support this kind of budgetary policy.