

unless the Government expects to take in more money and only from those people who are no longer going to be able to make the deduction for charitable donations?

Mr. Fisher: Be honest about the answer. It is not out of the pockets of the charities.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Speaker, it is not out of the pockets of the charities, it is out of the pockets of the public. But Government does not come clean and say to the public: "We have now put through another devious plan to impose another hidden tax on you". The Parliamentary Secretary does well to bring this matter out, and my colleague, the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley), absolutely hit the nail on the head. We are dealing here with flim-flam if we are talking about a tax proposal which will do something to stimulate growth in the country. This tax measure is a kind of disincentive and a kind of dishonesty.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, one very true thing which the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean) said was that we are dealing with flim-flam, because what I have heard from him and his two colleagues directly opposite from me is flim-flam. Is it now the position of the Tory Party that people should be able to get credit for charitable donations which they do not make?

Mr. Fisher: That is right. Good for you.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): That is what the Hon. Member is saying, Mr. Speaker. That is not the position of this Government. When the Hon. Member says it costs charitable organizations \$8 for every receipt they issue, that is the ultimate red herring. That is a lot of hogwash. The Hon. Member knows better. When he has his colleague stand up and put "patsy" questions to him in that regard, he is being quite dishonest with this House. If it is the position of the Tory Party that people should receive tax credits for charitable donations which they do not make, let him stand in his place now and say so.

Mr. Fisher: That is exactly his position on this.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Speaker, the position of this Party is that the Government ought to bring before the people of Canada incentives, not disincentives. In the action it has taken, it has put a disincentive in front of the people of Canada. My hon. colleague can try to divert the attention of the House, and of the public who follow this debate, so that they will somehow believe that is not the issue. The issue is whether there is an incentive, and here there is a disincentive, plus a penalty in terms of the cost which is imposed on each of those 47,000 voluntary agencies.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, we have now had a new position from the Tory Party, that it is in fact an incentive for people to give if they do not have to show they have given. That is the most convoluted logic I have heard yet. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what the Government has done is to put an incentive in the tax system to say: "If you

Income Tax Act

give, and show you have given, you will receive a tax credit for it". What the Official Opposition is saying is: "You do not have to give, and you do not have to show you have given, and you can still receive a tax credit for it". Is that the position of the Opposition?

Mr. Fisher: That is exactly what they are saying.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Speaker, my colleague says we need a charitable institution to help the Hon. Member. It seems to me that what we are talking about here is proposals put forward by Canada's National Voluntary Organization, and we are talking about a government which gives them half a loaf and attempts to "snow" them.

Obviously, the issue is not whether there should be tax receipts at any point. What we are talking about is a proposal which includes the removal of the \$100 tax allowance, and included in that should be the incentive to offset the costs which would somehow stimulate and send a signal to Canadians that the work that those people are doing is worth while.

The proposals were fully before the committee and the Department. This is not a discussion, Mr. Speaker, which is beginning today, although I welcome this discussion. The Government commissioned a report under Judge Andreychuk in 1974. In 1978 it had a consultation. In 1981 the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox), then the Minister responsible for charitable organizations, met with voluntary agency representatives in consultation and it was all reviewed.

We have now had a succession of Secretaries of State and Ministers of Finance review the matter. For Hon. Members to come to the House and somehow indicate that the matter has not been looked at, that there were not some proposals of give and take on both sides, that there were not some new proposals—the work of edicting them has not even been done by government or Statistics Canada—does absolutely no credit to this place or give any encouragement to that sector which wonders where this Government may go.

Mr. Bosley: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Hon. Member for Waterloo a simple question in an attempt to deal with the lack of understanding of Hon. Members opposite with respect to anything about charities and volunteer agencies in Canada. Is it not a fact that before the changes in this income tax measure, one could give and did not receive any credit unless one were in a relatively high bracket, and the Budget change took away the automatic deduction but introduced no new incentive whatsoever to increase one's charitable donation to any charity in order to help those who need help? Is it also not a fact that the Government estimates that through this change it will increase its coffers by \$80 million without giving anyone out there any incentive additional to what is already in the law to help those who need help?

Mr. McLean: I thank my hon. colleague for the question, Mr. Speaker. We have already agreed, and the Parliamentary Secretary has confirmed, the matter of the additional government revenues of \$80 million. Earlier in my remarks I gave the example that under the present format, with respect to persons