

out with some support measures, be able to look for another job and thereby assure the well-being of their family over the interim period. That is not what happened, Mr. Speaker. We heard a lot about the suffering and the disaccommodation by the Government taking such a retrogressive step.

● (1730)

Last week's Budget reports an increase of \$1.9 billion in taxes, with \$1.5 billion of this amount being placed on individuals while only \$380 million will be placed on corporations. Do you call that justice when \$1.5 billion is placed on individuals and only \$380 million is placed on corporations?

Last year's Mulroney-Wilson Budget reported tax cuts for companies but increases for individuals of \$1 billion for the coming fiscal year, 1986-87. The combined Budgets provide a personal tax increase of nearly \$30 billion for the years 1985-86 to 1990-91 inclusive, while corporate tax increases for the same period will amount to just over \$6 billion. Is it fair to have a personal tax increase of \$30 billion while the corporate tax increase will be only \$6 billion? In other words, personal tax increases will be five times as much as corporate tax increases. Can the Minister of finance explain why those at the lower end of the income spectrum are facing taxes higher than those sitting comfortably on the top? Can he explain in particular while those earning \$40,000 are expected to absorb from 1985 to 1987 a tax increase of 9.4 per cent while those earning \$150,000 get a tax decrease of \$1.4 per cent? What kind of nonsense is this? Canadians do not find this fair.

I object to this borrowing Bill.

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton-Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, I rise once again on this Bill, this time on the amendment. I have expressed my deep disappointment with the policies of the Government for which it is asking us, in three short paragraphs on one page, to ante up \$22.6 billion in order to carry out policies with which the Canadian people have become disenchanted.

My concern right now is for the young people of this country, a very large number of whom are unemployed and can only look ahead to being a generation being passed by.

I am very disappointed, as are most Canadians, with the repetitious replies given by Members on the Government benches when asked and challenged about the tragic unemployment situation. The Conservatives cites statistics to show that they have improved the situation very much in the past year. Indeed, the statistics may suggest that the situation has improved, and well it should, but what the Conservatives fail to mention is that their unemployment figures are still well above what they were before the recession came about.

The level of jobs that existed before the recession came has not yet been achieved. Instead of talking about how much they have done in the last while under circumstances of huge, burgeoning stock market results in the United States and the very healthy economy throughout the world instead of boasting about employment, the Government should be ashamed of

the figures when seeing them in relation to the situation before the recession.

The figures in any case are of no use to them. When they talk about the million and a half people who are still unemployed, and are still boastful about that great employment achievement, there is no achievement to the million and a half unemployment when they can still find no jobs.

Another aspect, which has not been dealt with by the Government and for which it will have to account to Canadians in due course is the whole matter of how it has dealt with the voluntary sector. By the voluntary sector, I mean charitable and community organizations. This sector, which has been proven to be the largest job creation sector in Canada, one of the most labour intensive sectors, which provides services to Canadians at the least possible cost and which the Government could never duplicate, where our young people might find jobs and a place to serve and feel useful, has been given no incentives and no recognition.

Over the past few years, the percentage of people and companies contributing to charities unfortunately is declining, as is the size and the percentage of their gifts in terms of income. The National Voluntary Organization has for years been advocating new incentives in income tax to increase charitable giving. More specifically, it has advocated the so-called give-and-take program which would provide a 50 per cent tax credit for charitable contributions.

This is what the present Minister of State for Immigration (Mr. McLean) promised before the Government was elected in 1984. When in opposition, the present Minister of State for Immigration made the give and take proposal his, if you might call it, pet crusade.

Let us look at a few of the promises he made. I can hardly do justice to all of them, but when in Opposition, the Minister of State for Immigration, who prior to this was the Secretary of State, said:

We are committed to a fundamental realignment of the tax treatment for charitable giving—the principle of a charitable tax credit—which will offer equitable incentives to all taxpayers to support their charities.

In other words, he said that he was entirely in favour of the give and take proposal. When he became Secretary of State, under whose area this particular subject falls, we know that nothing took place. He also said that the voluntary sector was the largest employer of lower and middle-class Canadians. He was right when he pointed out its importance.

In addressing the voluntary sector, the Minister of State for Immigration said:

You offer many less advantaged Canadians a bridge to employment. Canada's voluntary sector is an untapped resource that not only can reduce government spending but can actually create jobs in the process.

The Minister said that not only would there be more jobs but that the voluntary sector would also reduce spending, two apparent objectives of the Government.

Because the Conservatives are committed to more jobs for young people and because the Conservatives are committed to reduce spending, he said before the election: