

Supply

This kind of politics does not represent fairness for the Canadian family. It is dishonest class politics of the worst kind. The kind of politics revealed in this Budget takes from ordinary Canadians and gives to the rich. Then the Government has the nerve to tell ordinary Canadians that what is being done is fair; not only fair, but that it is necessary. We in the New Democratic Party believe that this approach is neither necessary nor fair. Canadians did not vote for this, and we say that Canadians will not put up with this.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: We believe that a democracy must serve the interests of all the people, not just the privileged and the powerful. In stating this belief, I know I am not speaking simply for the New Democratic Party of Canada, but for all of the people of this country. I say today what I have said before in a different context. It may well be the case that the business community has never before in Canadian history put all its financial and organizational resources behind a Conservative Party as they did in the last election. It may be the case that the business community, through the spokespersons of organized groups that have come to speak to the cabinet Members, and specifically the Minister of Finance before he prepared his Budget, spoke from their points of view and their points of interest. I want to say to the Conservative Government, it was not just the business community that voted the Conservative Party. It was ordinary people all across this land who voted and elected a minority on the opposition side, but the majority of Conservative voters were ordinary people. It is time this Conservative Government listened to the ordinary people who voted for them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Broadbent: Let us now consider our tax system, Mr. Speaker. I already mentioned that after this Budget, an average family will pay \$500 more than in 1984, while the wealthier will pay \$900 less. In 1961, corporations in Canada bore 20 per cent of the tax burden here in our country, but it is now only 11 per cent. I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) this: Why increase the tax burden for the poor in Canada, why such an increase for average families but none at all for large corporations? The simple truth is that the Conservative Government, like the Liberal Government before it, is not prepared to tax those who hold power and wealth. Big business benefits from a whole range of government programs and services: financing, research and development, personnel training allowances, rescue plans, interest-free loans, even infrastructure like roads, railways and

airports. Average families pay the large corporations' share, although taxes for these families will go up \$700 this year and a further \$1,000 by 1991 with the new regressive sales tax.

The business community has made reducing the deficit this Government's number one priority and it is this same business community which is largely responsible for the deficit. Big business is not calling for an end to their preferential treatment which has enabled them to defer \$34 billion in taxes, an amount equivalent to the federal deficit that concerns them so much. If the Government shares their concern, why did it not at least introduce a minimum income tax on profitable large corporations such as the United States now has? What is needed is a thorough analysis of all tax expenditures, in order to eliminate loopholes that put an additional burden on Canadian taxpayers without being of any benefit to the Canadian public.

Some financial incentives to business are justified, such as measures to assist regional development and R and D.

But if the Government wants to increase its revenues, the Income Tax Act is a real gold mine, or it would be, if the Government had the guts to make its business pals pay their fair share of the tax burden. Let's look at unemployment insurance.

• (1130)

[*English*]

I heard real concern from my colleague, the Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). He was at committee with the head of the Economic Council of Canada. Yesterday, the head of the Economic Council of Canada came before that committee and my colleague asked about the current level of unemployment being at 7.5 per cent. If I remember correctly, the original mandate of the Economic Council of Canada was set up in 1963. Its obligation was to set out a target and make proposals to the Government of Canada for achieving full employment. Originally, the *raison d'être* of this organization was to propose means of moving us toward full employment.

When asked about the current level of 7.5 per cent, the head of the Economic Council of Canada stated that 7.5 per cent is full employment. I remind that person now, and I remind the Government that, in 1963 when that Council was set up, 3 per cent was said to be full employment. In my early years here in the early 1970s that was changed to 4 per cent by the then Liberal Government. Therefore, we have to redefine constantly the new level of acceptability which went up to 4 per cent, and now, as the head of the Economic Council of