

defective. Yet, in order to try to save a seat in Cape Breton, which it lost anyway, the government gave \$2.2 million to the same company.

• (1530)

That may seem like a small concern, but to the taxpayers across this country, \$2.2 million wasted and \$2.2 million given to an incompetent company which had not paid back the money it had received previously strikes me as something which is highly questionable to those Canadians.

I admit that it is a small matter compared to some of the other items of ridiculous waste which this government has put into effect.

I was part of a committee which looked carefully at the sale of the de Havilland Corporation to the Boeing Corporation of the United States. The government in its ideological blindness decided to privatize de Havilland. It sold a company which was worth at least \$1 billion, possibly \$2 billion—it was never quite clear—for the total price of \$90 million. That itself might seem to be enough of an example of incompetence and stupidity on the part of this government.

Let me tell you, this government did not stop there. A few years later the Boeing corporation came back for more. Despite the fact that Boeing had a chance to go through every inch of factory at de Havilland before making that purchase, before signing that deal, Boeing stated, as a naive company, that it just did not realize or understand the problems that it was getting into. That poor Boeing corporation with annual sales of \$5 billion per year simply had to ask the government to help it put this de Havilland corporation into a situation where safety measures are up to scratch throughout this factory.

We in our party believe very strongly in such safety measures. We believe they are the responsibility of the owners of companies. Boeing had complete access to every inch of that factory, every document and every piece of material with respect to the financial state of that company, because Boeing testified to that effect in committee. We believe that it was responsible for establishing those safe conditions. Did the Government of Canada show a little bit of backbone to this American company which had already managed to purchase an

important Canadian national asset at \$90 million, when it was probably worth \$1 billion?

No, Madam Speaker. Instead another \$160 million was given to Boeing.

It is unbelievable that Canada actually paid the Boeing Corporation of the United States \$70 million to take off our hands this \$1 billion asset. That is responsibility, Conservative style. That is economic management, Conservative style.

**Mr. Parker:** That is incompetence.

**Mr. Langdon:** My colleague says that is incompetence. I think he is too kind. He offers just mild condemnation when absolute abject stupidity is what should be identified with this government for these and other sets of actions which it has undertaken.

When I first spoke in the House back in 1984, I suggested that the government's plans to try to cut back, to slice important social programs, employment programs, programs that helped science and technology would mean that by 1990 we would still have a deficit in this country of over \$30 billion. The Conservatives laughed. They said there was no chance of that happening.

Well, Madam Speaker, let me quote from the budget documents for the fiscal year ending 1990 which state that the level of deficit which this government is running on a year-to-year basis is \$30.5 billion. Its approach has been, right from the start, prophesized as bankrupt. It is now seen to have been totally bankrupt. Instead of giving this country the economic base to build for the future, it has given us a debt of \$351 billion, a year-by-year deficit of over \$30 billion, interest rates which are higher than they have been since before this government took power; levels of unemployment which, once more, on a quarterly basis are rising; taxes which have gone up 31 times in the last six years.

All of that is combined with tremendous breaks for the wealthy, such as the exemptions on capital gains tax. Let me give an example of another tax break. Madam Speaker, I know that you would not be somebody who would be likely to do this, but let us say that you are in business and take a group of associates out for a magnificent meal.