

tists, veterinarians and chiropractors, who are now able to pay income tax at a lower level than they did the night before, who is cheering? As if there were not already enough loopholes in the tax system to cater to the privileged few in society, the Minister of Finance has opened up a new set of loopholes. Where they paid 33½ per cent income tax, they now pay 25 per cent. In other words, the Minister of Finance has put thousands and thousands of dollars into the hands of the upper income people, the doctors and lawyers who are involved in incorporating their businesses and are involved in business ventures.

The question must be asked: Who is going to pay for all of these loopholes that have been provided? Who is going to make up the difference? Somebody has to pay the taxes in this country. Somebody has to pay for all the loopholes for the corporations that have been added and for the additional loopholes for the upper income earners of Canada. Did the Minister of Finance do what people across this country have asked him to do, namely rescind the tax increases that he brought in last April that touched every Canadian family? He did not. Therefore, \$200 or \$300 will be taken from the pockets of every Canadian family to pay for the additional loopholes provided in the Budget last night.

The Minister of Finance says that we helped young people in this country. The young people should be cheering, but do you hear the young people of this country, particularly those who are out of work, cheering today? When you look carefully at this \$150 million that the Minister of Finance has provided for youth unemployment, you see it is the same amount as the little Liberal slush fund that we have been talking about for the last few days. When you analyse that and break it down, how much of the unemployed youth are going to be assisted?

● (1210)

Visualize the unemployed youth of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and apply this particular amount of money. It will provide a 12-month job for only 1.5 per cent of all those unemployed today. It is 1.5 per cent for a single year. What about the hundreds and thousands of young people in the next few weeks and months who will be coming on to the job market seeking employment, those coming out of our universities, colleges, technical, trade and secondary schools? That is the assistance this Government has provided for our unemployed youth. It is a pittance. I do not understand how the Minister of Finance has the courage to stand in his place and say as part of his Budget Speech that he and his Government are going to help the young people with this miserly, this miserable, this minute amount of money.

Mr. Lalonde: It is \$1.3 billion.

Mr. Riis: Then the Minister of Finance said: "We are going to help the senior citizens of Canada; we are going to increase the contribution to the guaranteed income supplement". A few months ago the Minister of Finance assembled a task force to talk to people across the country to try to understand the needs of senior citizens and to make recommendations to the Gov-

ernment. The task force did that. It said the beginning step this Government should take was to increase the GIS immediately by \$100 a month. Did the Minister do that? No, he did not do that. He provided half of that.

Let us break it down. The senior citizens of Canada on GIS will receive an increase on July 1 this year of 75 cents a day. My parents are senior citizens. I phoned them and said: "Great news, Mom and Dad; you are going to get 75 cents a day starting July 1 from the Minister of Finance". They were not particularly pleased. This means that still today as a result of this so-called improvement for the senior citizens of Canada, hundreds and thousands of them will still be living below the poverty line, the poverty line as described by the Government of Canada. Hundreds and thousands of our senior citizens will be in this situation. Is there anything in this Budget for the war vets, those who fought in Dieppe? No, there is not a thing. Is there any increase for our war vets, people we know who are struggling to survive? No, there is nothing.

Mr. Evans: They get the GIS.

Mr. Riis: There are hundreds and thousands of senior citizens living below the poverty line and the Minister of Finance and the Government says it is going to make a significant contribution to pensions. Then, of course, comes the RRSPs. This will be the real saviour for people's pension systems. When you look closely, Mr. Speaker, many Canadians can take advantage of the RRSPs. They can put in \$1,000 or \$2,000, and many people do. But the Minister of Finance did not assist so much the average Canadian taxpayer. He said: "We are going to lift the ceiling to \$15,500 a year". If you have an extra \$10,000 or \$15,000 in loose cash at the end of the year, you can invest that in a pension plan. Those who will benefit to the maximum from this allowance are those people whose incomes are nearly \$90,000 a year. Those are the ones who will be able to take advantage of the maximum benefit, those with nearly \$90,000 a year.

I do not think there is any question of the hypocrisy of this Government. It brings in this Budget and, as my Hon. Leader suggests, it gives those people an \$8,000 tax benefit. But the Government said it has changed its mind now and it is going to send out a signal to labour across the country. The Government is now going to ask labour to join in a co-operative venture in terms of getting the economy back on track. The Government said it has just given tax breaks to its friends in the corporate sector and tax breaks to upper income Canadians; but it is now going to ask labour to join in the recovery program. As a first gesture, the Government said it is going to restore free collective bargaining to the public sector. That is like putting a gun to somebody's head and saying: "Now we are going to start free collective bargaining". It is a Russian roulette approach to this whole business.

The Government said it is going to bargain collectively with labour, but it also said: "If you do not agree with us, if you do not do exactly what we say, we are going to legislate a settlement". Is that free collective bargaining? Is that the kind