

The Budget—Mr. Keyes

This is the Government's message. However, a leading Toronto psychiatrist spoke recently of this Budget in the long term. She spoke of the thousands and thousands of angry and bewildered young people 15 years from now whose beleaguered single parents will be unable to provide an environment and care even close to what an intelligent, caring culture knows is essential to a healthy early childhood.

Once again, this Government is focusing on those most vulnerable to solve its overspending problems, totally oblivious to the long-term social responsibility for society. I say to the Deputy Prime Minister that whenever a single sparrow has fallen, this Government has clipped its wings and it must be held accountable.

The Government might say to this that there are millions of other Canadians with solid jobs and salaries who will not suffer, whose lives will be enriched by this Budget. I say to them that this Budget has its arsenals pointed right at personal initiative for middle-income families and small businessmen.

In 1988, personal taxes represented 47 per cent of government expenditures, corporate taxes only 9 per cent. In 1988 terms, had corporate sector contributions matched, kept pace with those of personal taxpayers, the Canadian Government would have a surplus of \$18.5 billion.

What is particularly intolerable to Canadians is that this Government has browbeaten its citizens by encouraging a policy of high interest rates. Yet it has abandoned any effort to get back any of the resulting high banking profits to the benefit of our citizens, citizens who fed that profit. What happened to the Government's 1987 plan to impose a fiscal margin tax on financial institutions?

This feeling that each of us is looking down the barrel of a fiscal cannon is shared by small business across Canada. Mr. Bullock, president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, claims that small business people are being bombarded today because of a spending spree the Government has been on for two years now. Small business will not only be buried in taxes, it will be mired in red tape. Jeff Ruben, senior economist at Wood Gundy Limited, predicts a policy-mandated recession.

At McMaster University in my riding of Hamilton West, the Government has decided not to fund the upgrading of the McMaster nuclear reactor which, in the

opinion of international scientists, would make the reactor fifth in the world in productivity and research. This update would have cost \$18 million, coincidentally exactly the same amount that the Government has cut from Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. In essence, this Budget does not enable initiative, it cripples it.

The Government continues to see the average Canadian's car as a luxury comparable to the sins of liquor or cigarettes. Since 1984, its tax on gasoline has gone from 1.5 cents a litre to 7.5 cents a litre. Apparently, the Government has forgotten that this is a vast and often isolated country in which our capacity to bridge distances is essential to holding jobs or seeking new initiatives for taking charge of our lives. Canadians in rural areas often drive long distances to work and they have little public transportation. On average, motorists can expect to pay close to \$600 annually in gasoline taxes, but those, of course, in rural areas who require vehicles for the normal conduct of their lives will pay double that, double \$600 a year. However, this too does not surprise us for there are other aspects of the Budget which tear at the fabric of Canadian life.

It is enough of a struggle in this vast land to maintain a powerful sense of community and to hold on to roots set down over a lifetime. Yet this Government plans to cripple VIA Rail by forcing it to cut back on the very communities in which the need is the greatest. It will further tax long distance phone calls in a country in which distance makes calls essential, not frivolous.

We also understand the role of amateur sport in the family life of Canadian communities. We know its essential role in the healthy development of our children, the good, solid values for our young people and its significance in maintaining fitness among an aging adult population. Amateur groups have been more than meeting their their objective of becoming largely self-funding over the past four years. For instance, in the Canadian Soccer Association, local affiliations have managed to go well beyond that fifty-fifty split with the Government to raise 70 per cent from private sources. What is the reward of these groups for such fiscal accountability? Once again the Government has broken faith with these people and has cut back its smaller share of the responsibility. Could this Government not even guarantee its meagre contributions?