

would like, at least in this detail, to oblige him. I am speaking, of course, of the Minister of State for Youth (Mrs. Champagne) who has no programs, no budget, and nothing very much to say when she is given the opportunity in the House. Nevertheless, on her payroll she is maintaining a chief of staff, a limousine, and presumably a driver, and an executive assistant. We have received no bulletin which states that there has been a reduction of staff or reassignment of responsibilities, which any organization in the private or public sector, under the circumstances, would find quite appropriate and reasonable. As far as we know, there is still that ministerial encumbrance—

[*Translation*]

A staff that obviously does nothing and is utterly useless in a department that has no program and no budget . . . But nevertheless, these people keep their jobs and remain employed and they keep on being a burden on the taxpayers—

[*English*]

The taxpayers of the country must support them in the style to which the Government has made them accustomed.

Although I could continue, I will turn away from the matter of ministerial staffs and the way in which they have swollen from the Prime Minister's Office on down. I would now like to turn to what the Government uses the money for when it gets it. The prime example from last year was bank bail-outs. A couple of Canadian banks failed and, quite gratuitously, without any great urging on the part of their advisers, and without any great pressure in the ranks of the Cabinet, the Government decided that it would be like the little boy at the dike and put its finger in to plug the hole. That particular hole and that particular finger cost the taxpayers of this country \$1 billion, or so it would appear from the accounts presented. I doubt very much if the final bills are in.

• (1750)

Let us go now to the topic of tax loopholes. The Government often says that the Right Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) is the father of the deficit. It must be admitted that there is some justice to that allegation. However, I think we should look at the way in which the deficit has been built up. As my friend, the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) pointed out, it has been built up through a gradually shifting balance between the personal and corporate tax contributions to the cost of running Government. Over the past 30 years we have seen personal taxes gradually rise and corporate taxes gradually fall. That is something the Progressive Conservative Government should be working to reverse rather than reinforce. Yet the Government is going to allow corporate tax contributions to drop to less than 20 per cent of total taxes raised this year.

The Government also introduced a capital gains tax break, and allowed the little Egypt bump in the case of Gulf oil. Concerning indirect taxes, we see the Government's major preoccupation is not with imposing taxes in such a way that the economy will not stagger under the load; it is simply concerned with the revenues which can be yielded through tax

Borrowing Authority Act

increases. Therefore, in the last Budget, even with an outcry against taxes on gasoline, we saw taxes go up four-tenths of a cent a litre at the wholesale level. The federal sales tax increased by 1 per cent, following on the previous increase of 1 per cent for which this Government tried to evade responsibility by saying it had been foreseen by the previous Government. Perhaps worst of all, we now have a VAT by another name in the form of the business transfer tax which the Government is now promoting across the country. We know what the agenda is. It is simply to get more out of the economy for government operations. We have not seen the Government differentiate between this business transfer tax and the hated value added tax which imposes such an enormous accounting burden. The Government has not addressed that point at all.

Finally, if I may, I would like to—you are giving me the time signal, Mr. Speaker? I cannot believe it. I was really just getting started. However, I will close by stating my opposition to this borrowing Bill and I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am very pleased to participate in the debate on the borrowing authority. Any discussion of this subject cannot, of course, be carried on in isolation. One naturally has to link it to the Budget handed down last month. Also, of course, one has to link that Budget to the May, 1985 Budget. When Canadians do that, they ask whether the Budgets are appropriate and fair. In both Budgets we got a mountain of documents, figures, graphs and all the rest of it. We as parliamentarians have to break those documents down to their lowest common denominator in a way which can be understood by average Canadians from coast to coast. When that is done, Canadians can then distinguish the true colours of this Conservative Government.

This Government has been going across the land saying these Budgets are tough but fair. They are not. They are simply tough and unfair. We realize very quickly just how unfair not only the imposition of new taxes is, but how and to whom the new taxes are directed. If you earn between \$15,000 and \$20,000 a year, by 1990 you will be paying a tax increase of some 23 per cent. If you earn \$30,000 to \$35,000, the increase drops to approximately 15 per cent. If you earn \$100,000 or \$200,000, the increase is only 1 per cent. I ask you, Canadians are asking themselves, and in 1988 will be asking the Government: Is that fair and equitable? The obvious answer is a resounding no. You cannot expect Canadians to see that kind of disparity as being fair. You cannot ask the individual earning \$15,000 to tighten his or her belt more than his neighbour earning \$100,000. All Canadians, regardless of income, regardless of region, are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to enhance the economic wealth and prosperity of this country. What they are not prepared to do is to make sacrifices that other Canadians are not being asked to make. Therein lies the injustice and unfairness. We are asking one economic class in this country, the lower-income groups, to pull more weight than their wealthy friends. That will fuel the fires of disparity.