

*Adjournment Motion*

individuals could earn as much as but not more than \$23,500. This year they are increasing federal sales tax by one per cent, but to compensate for this, they give us a handout of \$50 per adult and \$25 per child, but only for those earning \$15,000 or less, that is, those below the poverty line. Another clear example that this Budget is not fair. Although the Government is going to do everything it can and ask all Conservative Members to sell this Budget, it will not succeed, because people will begin to understand that this Budget is not fair.

[English]

**Mr. Brisco:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments and pose a question. It is useful, most of the time, to listen to the Opposition to see if in their comments there are some pearls of wisdom which will shed new light, some new recommendations for change which may not have occurred to us. That is the role of the Opposition, to offer alternatives. I very much regret that I have not heard one alternative or one useful suggestion. Instead, I have heard nothing but railing against a Budget which people generally have accepted as a good Budget, including Mr. Bulloch who the Hon. Member made reference to. Did he not watch his own leader on television when the interviewer said: "Mr. Turner, don't you finally agree that this is a good budget?" I would also ask him if he read Jeffrey Simpson's column in *The Globe and Mail* on Wednesday morning? That would be an excellent guide to the thinking of Canadians on this Budget.

**Mr. Gagliano:** Which one should I take, *The Globe and Mail* or *La Presse*? They all say the same thing. *The Financial Post*?

**Mr. Brisco:** How about making a useful suggestion?

**Mr. Gagliano:** If you want to reduce corporate income tax, why not do it across the line? Why does small business get less than big business?

**Mr. Brisco:** Don't rationalize, just tell us how.

**Mr. Gagliano:** Well, if you decide a corporate—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** On that basis, questions and comments are now terminated. It being four o'clock—

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 46, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows:

The Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine)—The Economy—Le Conseil du patronat du Québec—The deficit—Government position; the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell)—Terrorism—International security measures—Canada's position; the Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard-Anjou (Mr. Gagliano)—Unemployment Insurance—Difficulties facing early retirees. (b) Scope of regulations.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### THE BUDGET

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

**Hon. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to enter this debate and indicate my strong support for the initiatives taken by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in this Budget, as well as for the direction he has given this country since he assumed that portfolio. This is the third major initiative he has taken. His first was in November, 1984 when he laid down a program which indicated his strong intentions to move against the horrific deficit this country was facing. He was going to try to bring our accounts into order so that not only this but future generations would derive some long-term benefit from his actions. He moved from there to his Budget last year. We now have this Budget. We are onstream, moving in the right direction, and at the same time showing the Canadian people that the extra taxes we are going to extract from them will be far less than the cut-back in the over-involvement of Government in the lives of Canadians. As a result, we will be moving forward into the next decade in a way which should give every Canadian confidence that they have a man steering our economic course who fully understands the complexity of the financial situation in this nation. He has taken the type of steps that can only be of long-term benefit to the nation.

I noted that one Member, in questioning an opposition Member, indicated that 70 per cent of the cuts have come out of Government services. In other words, we are cutting back a bloated bureaucracy in a way which can only be of benefit to all Canadians. This will produce long-term savings for the people of this nation and result in their having to pay less taxes over the long term. I happen to come from Atlantic Canada and the only Prime Minister, until this Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), who really took a serious look at our economic problems and tried to take innovative actions of long-term benefit to our area was John Diefenbaker. The Diefenbaker years were good years for our part of Canada. In this Budget I see some new thinking, some innovative thinking, some real programs that are going to produce long-term benefits for the