

The Budget—Mr. Deans

which was given to doctors, lawyers, accountants and consultants. These people expect to pay their tax, whether or not they have an income. Their spouses, perhaps earning \$80 to \$100 a week, will be taxed at the personal income tax rate for that particular class of individual. Yet the Government, failing to recognize the tremendous problems which those people face, has the audacity to come into the House of Commons and propose that those who already have sufficient income, those who already live high off the hog, those who can afford to pay their mortgages and provide for their families, should be given further tax breaks. But those who are unemployed, who no longer qualify for unemployment insurance benefits, those who find themselves, faced with an inadequate income base, not able to meet their commitments, will be expected to continue to pay their tax. For them there was absolutely nothing in this Budget which will ease the burden of pain which they carry around with them on a daily basis.

There was a pittance in the Budget for youth employment. It was an amount which would provide jobs—if the jobs can be provided—for 10,000 young people. That is 10,000 people out of the 400,000 people who fall into that category, who are looking for work. One cannot help but feel a sense of frustration and anger when one sees the Government's reactions to the legitimate problems of people. It has money for the oil companies; they received \$190 million immediately in tax relief. But there was no money for those with no income who still had commitments. There was money in the way of tax relief for the professional class, but there was no money for those who have used up their unemployment insurance benefits, who can no longer pay their mortgage commitments and who have no future to look forward to. There was money in tax relief for those whose incomes were in the \$50,000, \$60,000 and \$70,000 a year bracket by way of more openings for RRSPs, but there was no money for the people who were unemployed through no fault of their own, who are unemployed primarily as a result of this Government's economic policies in the past two or three years. There is no money for the unemployed, those who are without the prospect of a job, who no longer qualify for unemployment insurance benefits and who find themselves losing everything they have worked for.

This Government is out of touch. One cannot help but ask, if the Government is going to allow hundreds of millions of tax dollars, perhaps billions of tax dollars, not to be collected as a result of the changes which were made in this Budget, and if the cost of government continues to increase, who then is going to be asked to carry the additional tax burden? When the tax rate for doctors, lawyers, accountants and consultants is reduced from 45 per cent average to 15 per cent average, someone else has to pay the difference, and it will not be the 2,000 people who earned \$50,000 or more last year and who did not pay one single, solitary cent in tax. Neither will it be the 287 people who each earned over a quarter of a million dollars last year and did not pay a single, solitary cent in tax.

The people who will be asked to pick up the tax burden so that the already well off can be better off will be the people

who go out and punch a clock at seven in the morning, work eight hours every day and have their tax deducted at source. They do not have the opportunity to write off any of these loophole benefits which this Government produces and provides. Those people, Mr. Speaker, who earn the minimum wage will still have to pay their taxes. They will not have the money to buy an RRSP. They will not have the opportunity to take advantage of deductions in their tax rate, as will the professional classes which this Government is cosying up to at the moment. I recognize that farmers and certain fishermen will benefit and that is fine, because in the main those people's earnings are considerably below what one might reasonably expect in a country such as ours.

A doctor in 1982 had a net income of \$50,000; his federal tax payable was \$12,220, his provincial tax payable was \$5,886, for a combined tax burden of \$18,086. In 1985, given that he now qualifies, for some unknown reason, as a result of this Budget, for a small business tax rate, and given that in 1985 he is able to put an additional \$4,500 into an RRSP, the same doctor earning \$50,000 a year will pay a federal tax of \$6,825, a provincial tax of \$4,550 in the Province of Ontario, for a combined tax of \$11,375.

● (1210)

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the tax saving for that one doctor is almost equivalent to the total UIC payment for a full year for one unemployed person. That tells you something about the priorities of this Government. If this Government has sufficient revenue to be able to give these kinds of tax breaks to those individuals, then, by God, it has the revenue to give some kind of relief to those who are unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: This same Government in its Budget, out of the kindness of its heart—should we ever find where its heart is—gives pensioners an additional \$600 a year. Doctors get almost \$7,000 a year in tax relief and they do not really need it. Lawyers get almost \$7,000 a year in tax relief. All these consultants who troop around the Parliament Buildings on a regular basis get tax relief of \$7,000 a year. Accountants get tax relief of \$7,000 a year on already inflated incomes. But all we can afford for a pensioner is a \$600 a year increase. The unemployed, who are hurting the most, get nothing. Not one red cent. That tells you something about this Government.

Mr. Riis: They get a tax increase.

Mr. Deans: As my colleague says, there is a tax increase in store for them. The Government will raise \$1 billion more this year through personal income taxes. That is not going to worry the doctors or the lawyers; they are getting a good break.

I often wonder just what the relationship is between that particular tax arrangement worked out carefully behind closed scenes, in the dead of night, and the Canada Health Act. On my way in this morning I read a billboard which said that your health may be in jeopardy as a result of the Canada Health Act. If that is not a threat, I do not know what is. I cannot