

The Budget—Mr. Bussières

For instance, the next time a Quebec taxpayer with three dependants—that is, his wife who has no gainful employment and two children—prepares his income tax return, he will have no tax to pay on his \$15,000 income. Another Quebec taxpayer with the same responsibilities and an equal number of dependants, that is, three, and who earns \$20,000, taking the escalation into account, will pay \$425 less in income tax in 1982, which is extremely important, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on giving examples that show the combined effect of the income tax table escalation, the marginal tax rate reduction—this rate which applies to taxable incomes—and the increase in income tax credit for low and average-income groups. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely important, to keep these figures in mind.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the House's attention to a number of tables which appear in the budget papers. Hon. members will remember that the budget was tabled together with many budget papers; I suggest that one must have a look at these papers in order to understand the general thrust of the budget. For instance, if one considers the effects or the estimated impact of the tax measures on the income tax to be paid to the federal treasury, taking into account the escalation and the tax cuts, one realizes that lower income groups, that is, those earning up to \$15,000, will see their income tax cut by 33.1 per cent, and the higher the tax rate, the lesser the tax cut. That is the example I gave earlier of the difference between progressive and regressive tax measures. A progressive tax measure—

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Joliette on a point of order.

Mr. La Salle: Naturally, I find the minister's comments on the benefits for Canadians earning less than \$15,000 most interesting. But could he add to that the list of indirect taxes which might come as a surprise for those same people?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member could ask for that information during question period. I recognize the hon. Minister of State.

Mr. Bussières: Mr. Speaker, at least I am polite. I regret that the hon. member takes these opportunities—

Mr. La Salle: I was not criticizing!

Mr. Bussières:—perhaps not, but I still regret the fact that the hon. member should take this opportunity to show Canadians that he has not read the budget papers. With his permission—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Joliette on a point of order.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I did not insult the minister. I simply asked him to add to his comments, which I find very interesting, the indirect taxes which taxpayers must bear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. member for Joliette has already had the opportunity to say what he is now saying. The hon. Minister of State for Finance.

Mr. Bussières: Although I do not have extended years of schooling, I do remember taking a course on how to learn. I recall our teacher saying that the lack of patience was the thing that hindered the learning process the most. So had the hon. member showed a little more patience he would have seen that I was just about to refer to the other benefits provided for in the budget. I will indicate to him that the table I am quoting from is on page 34 of the document "The Budget in More Detail", which I advise him to read—

An hon. Member: Assuming one knows how to read!

Mr. Bussières: Of course, one must know how to and also have the patience to read. He will notice in the table the rates and benefits which were removed for some so that taxes are in fact increased for the higher income Canadians, and that is combined with indexation of tax tables and a reduction in marginal tax rates. That is why I say that these are progressive measures in that they benefit the low or moderate-income Canadians. Obviously, those who earn \$75,000, \$100,000 or more will have to pay higher taxes. Those who earn between \$20,000 and \$30,000 will benefit—

● (1640)

[English]

Mr. Stevens: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I too have been following the minister's speech with great interest. He referred to the table and I wonder whether he could clarify one thing. The table to which he referred states that indirect taxation of revenue will contribute 51 per cent more to the federal coffers. Could he explain why this is so?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Hon. members may seek information during question period.

[Translation]

Mr. Bussières: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) had an opportunity to speak about the budget yesterday. On this side of the House, members listened very carefully. Unfortunately, we were all disappointed because he said virtually nothing. I would appreciate it if he would allow me to concentrate so that I can inform Canadians of these important budget proposals.

We have seen that these proposals reduce significantly the tax burden of low and middle-income Canadians. I believe that it is extremely important to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker. Today in the House some members mentioned that the president of the Canadian Federation of Small Business had