

Supply

get down to work, because if we want the people behind us, if we want them to elect us or support us, we had better speak their language. This morning we did not speak their language.

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief question.

I was very interested in the hon. member's comments and I agree with him. That is what our government has been trying to do. We have been trying to take a look at the economy to see where we can streamline and cut back on our spending and so on.

Do the hon. member's colleagues within his party agree whole-heartedly with what he suggested we do today, such as looking at universality and some of the other issues? Do they support that?

Mr. Edmonston: Mr. Speaker, not only members of my party but also those in the provincial governments support that position. If we look at their actions right now we will see them coming to grips with the reality of not having the money to spend that we have had in the past. It means that we have to take a hard look at universality. It means we will have to take a hard look at what is theory and what is reality, what are resolutions, and what has been past policy and try to put that in terms of today's reality.

There is a revolution going on. It is a revolution in thought. It is a revolution not along party lines on ideological lines but a revolution in which people are now asking not what is good for them but how much it will cost. That is an essential key to getting the public's confidence. How much will it cost? Can it be done efficiently? Is it practical? If we start thinking along those lines, no matter if we are Liberal, NDP or Conservative, we will have no trouble getting the public's vote.

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Science Technology and Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to ask my hon. friend, as he talked about controlling expenditures, if he would explain why the NDP government in Ontario increased its spending by 13 per cent last year.

The member raised the subject of EH-101s and says that the helicopter contract should be cancelled. I have

been a little bit confused by statements coming from his party about this because on the one hand his leader says the NDP wants to create jobs and yet the EH-101 contract will create 45,000 person-years of employment, and these are high-tech, good and valuable jobs that will position us well for future contracts.

The member's leader says that we need to have air-sea rescue helicopters. What on earth does she think the EH-101s are? When the minister of defence increased that order a year or so back from 25 to 50 it was so that the best helicopters in the world would be available to provide search and rescue for our fishermen and other seamen, so that we would have that equipment for fisheries patrol and also so we would have it for drug surveillance.

• (1330)

I suppose what they want to do is get rid of the Armed Forces. I do not know. What is the point of having state of the art equipment like our general purpose frigates and then not putting the equipment on them that is necessary to enable them to be efficient.

I have three questions. How would he equip the Armed Forces? What would he do with the general purpose frigates, of which nine are floating now, if we are not going to have the helicopters for them? How would he provide for the necessary fisheries patrol and air-sea rescue without the EH-101s?

Mr. Edmonston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my response by saying that having served in the military for three years and having been honourably discharged I am very supportive of our military. It is important that we have a strong military. However when we have—

Mr. McDermid: The American military.

Mr. Edmonston: The American military.

Mr. McCreath: We don't hate the Americans in here, we think they're all right.

An hon. member: They are our NATO allies.

Mr. Edmonston: We have to be careful when we are dealing with the purchase of these helicopters. I believe that these military helicopters are not suited for the job *per se* because of reports I received. We already have read in the newspapers that these are essentially sub-hunting helicopters. They have been called Cadillac helicopters.