

The Budget—Mr. Bradley

ing harm the acid content does to the environment, I think the Hon. Member should understand, and does understand, that the marriage of convenience between social policy and free enterprise which is characteristic of this country, which works well when there is lots of money, does not work so well when there is not lots of money.

Mr. Kristiansen: Is that not free enterprise?

Mr. Mackasey: The other gentleman is getting into it. Don't spoil your lunch. Go back to sleep.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please. The Chair regrets to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time for questions has expired. We now resume debate.

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the debate on the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) on February 15. It is an interesting Budget—a few things here and a few things there—but I do not see any general thrust in it at all. It does little to spur further recovery and does nothing to put the Government's financial house in order. Relative to the projections outlined in the 1983 Budget, spending, the deficit and interest costs are all up. This is a white paper Budget. Proposals are presented on mortgage protection, small business tax relief, profit sharing and pensions. These proposals are to be studied. They may or may not become reality but for the time being they give the appearance of action.

I looked at the Budget, Mr. Speaker, mainly to see what was in it for my constituents, the people of Haldimand-Norfolk, and I looked at youth. We know that there are hundreds of thousands of unemployed youth in the country. There are thousands in my own riding. The Budget says that creating jobs for Canada's youth is a priority, that the strength and vitality of our nation's youth depends on our young people. It also states that \$150 million will be added to the \$1 billion Youth Opportunity Fund announced in the Speech from the Throne.

I have two questions about that, Mr. Speaker. What is \$150 million going to do? It is less than the amount the Minister used to cover up the leak in his last Budget when an opportunist TV cameraman took an opportune shot of it. The Minister casually added \$200 million with a stroke of the pen in order to save his Budget and his neck. Does that mean we can assume that as far as the Minister is concerned the youth of the country mean less than his Budget or his neck? Let us be realistic, Mr. Speaker. Let us provide some permanent, long-term assistance and programs for the youth of the country.

We see that the Minister is going to continue his wage and price restraints. In his Budget Speech he said that the federal Government is firmly committed to continued wage and price restraint and that the existing policy of limiting increases in the prices that the federal Government sets and regulates will be continued for another year. He said as well that the guidelines will be reduced from 5 per cent to 4 per cent for this period and that mandatory wage controls in the public sector

will not be extended. The Government is not firmly committed to continued wage and price controls, Mr. Speaker, but only to price restraint—and only price restraint that it sets and regulates.

The liquor and tobacco industries would be glad to have had their increases for the past year set at 4 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The 15.8 per cent tax increase on cigarettes imposed in September was a price that in my estimation the federal Government sets and regulates. What we have is a government that already breaks its promises before they are implemented. We have a government that is attempting to tax the liquor industry and the tobacco industry out of existence in this country without being concerned about the consequences to the people involved in those industries.

• (1240)

With respect to the question of tax increases, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the hidden agenda. The Budget of February 15 contained no major tax increase. It did not have to. From the Budget of April, 1983, Mr. Speaker, we have the following increases which are now taking effect for the 1984-1985 year: the special recovery tax, adding an additional \$300 million; changes to the federal tax reduction, adding an additional \$445 million; elimination of the standard \$100 deduction, adding \$180 million; deindexing of the child tax credit income threshold, adding \$155 million; deindexing of the child exemption, adding \$40 million; making the Canadian Ownership Special Charge permanent, adding \$965 million, and the Unemployment Insurance Commission increase this year, Mr. Speaker, will add \$45 million. If we were to carry that same hidden program to 1986-1987, we would come to a total for that year of an additional \$5.654 billion. No, this Budget did not have to bring in tax increases; they are already there.

I come now to Revenue Canada, Mr. Speaker. We all know what Revenue Canada is; it is the Department that finds you guilty until proven innocent. Apparently it is going to change that. We are not going to be quite so guilty any more. That is the Department, you might recall, which has \$800 an hour auditors; the Department which provides free meals for the auditors who bring in the biggest increases in a month; the Department which provides the day off for the financial collectors who collect the most money in a month. That Department is going to be kind to us now, Mr. Speaker. Individuals and corporations with federal taxes of \$1,000 or less will no longer have to make quarterly tax instalments. This is a good step. This will assist those senior citizens who have wrongly been required to make quarterly instalments on earnings which, in most cases, do not arrive until the end of the year.

Second, that Department is going to pay up to \$1,000 for the cost of a successful appeal by someone who is appealing his tax assessment. This is a start, Mr. Speaker, but anyone out there in the country who has had to appeal their assessment knows that \$1,000 is not going to go very far. It will not even scratch the backs of their lawyers and accountants.