Mr. Turner (Halton—Peel): Mr. Speaker, I can be no more eloquent than my constituents.

Robert Beyette of Burlington wrote to me: "I suggest the Government of Canada run the business of the country and not the business of the people. All Canadians will win with less government. Bigger and more is not better". We have less government with this budget.

William Craig of Caledon East wrote: "I would like to see Canada get out of debt with tough measures. Re-educate and educate people to be in a position to compete globally". The budget does that.

Dave Stewart of Burlington wrote: "There will be a recovery. We are all part of the 90 per cent of Canadians surviving the recession". That is stressing the 90 per cent positive aspect not the 10 per cent negative. Mabel Mason is not a constituent. She is from Vancouver, B.C. She wrote: "To make things brighter and more secure the government should reduce taxes". The government has just reduced taxes in this budget.

Mr. Chris Creed of Burlington wrote: "I am concerned about the legacy we are leaving for generations to come". This budget is concerned about that legacy as well. It forecasts the deficit will fall to $27 billion next year, $22 billion the year after and $5.5 billion by 1995. That is reducing the legacy for generations to come.

John Beaumont of Bolton wrote: "You are suffering low polls due to taking strong measures to bring the deficit under control". He is right. The government is way down in the polls because the measures necessary to reduce the deficit and secure Canada's future have been tough. They have been brutally tough. No one on this side of the House is shying away from that. No one is less than proud of what we have done to address the problems that we inherited.

Mr. Guy Ricard (Laval-Ouest): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank my friend from Halton—Peel for sharing his time with me for this part of the debate.

[*Translation*]

When the Minister of Finance started to work on his budget, he looked at the facts this way: He looked at what we had in the past, the debts we had to pay, what we have now and what we should do for the future.

The debts that we had to pay are simply the national debt. As my colleague from Trois-Rivières explained briefly, the national debt now amounts to $420 billion. When we came to power in 1984, it was $206 billion. Compound interest is $239 billion over seven years and the government has a program operating surplus of $25 billion that can be taken from this expense item. We come up with a grand total of $420 billion. From there, the minister figured out how much he could collect in taxes and how much he should spend to meet the demand for programs. He tries to balance the budget. As you know, we have been unable to balance the budget for years, for the simple reason that we spend more than we receive. What is he trying to do? He is trying to cut spending as much as possible. Of course he will have to take the axe to something. Of course he will have to re-evaluate current programs, perhaps cancel some, try to do more with less, so that some day he can balance his budget.

When people tell us that we cut programs, or that we did not provide enough incentives for business, they should look at the key points in the budget. When we are told that people are hungry, that people want to work, that there are 1.5 million unemployed, I agree with that. Too many people are unemployed. To my mind, even one person without work is too many; everyone should work but sometimes unemployment is very high, which is an undesirable situation. Whether it is 1, 10, 15 or 25 per cent, I think that in some regions it is much too high, as we all know.

Now what are we doing to put all those people to work? Do we create federal government programs? Will the federal government hire 1.5 million people and pay them or will it try to give job creation incentives? Look at the highlights: action to bolster recovery, meaning economic recovery; reducing the personal income surtax; the home buyers' plan that allows using RRSPs to buy a first home. That will surely create jobs. More highlights: action for investment, initiative and jobs, manufacturing and processing. The manufacturing and processing tax rate will be reduced from 23 per cent to 22 per cent effective January 1, 1993, with a further reduction, to 21 per cent on January 1, 1994, that is 2 per cent in two years. If that is not an incentive I wonder what it is. The capital cost allowance rate will be increased for manufacturing and processing machinery from 25 to 30 per cent for machinery purchased after the budget date. This is