

*Supply*

where the Liberal Party proposes to generate those funds.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, the first response as to where one would get the money is that it would be found within the \$5.8 billion that is going to be spent on helicopters. A lot could be found by reducing the travel that is not always necessary such as the Prime Minister's last trip. However I will try to deal with the substance here and not be drawn into that kind of debate.

I want to correct an impression that my colleague somewhat mischievously played up suggesting we want everyone on payroll. Of course that is nonsense and my colleague knows that. He should not be making that kind of statement. He is much too fine a parliamentarian to stoop to that kind of thing.

What we are really asking today is whether the government's policies are wrong when one looks at the situation that 1.6 million Canadians are unemployed. Some people say it is closer to 3 million because some people have given up hope and are no longer looking for work. Some people have been forced into retirement because there is nothing else.

Within that 1.6 million who are officially unemployed, 421,000 are young men and women. That is a growing statistic. Even with 1.6 million people unemployed, 300,000 jobs are going unfilled according to recent statistics. Are government policies not wrong when there are almost 5 million people in Canada today either at or below the level of poverty? Most of them are women and over 1 million are young people.

We ask the same basic substantive question about government policies when 2.7 million Canadian people are receiving social assistance and 2.2 million people will be fed by food banks. We are not questioning whether or not the government has tried or whether or not the government has spent money. Of course it has.

The question we are raising is whether it is time for the government to admit that the policies it has put forward are failures when I cite statistics such as the ones I just shared. That is the basic fundamental question of importance to me, my colleagues and Canadians generally.

**Mr. McCreath:** Mr. Speaker, the one thing about the economic policies of this government is that the people of Canada know what they are.

I am not sure the people of Canada know exactly what the Liberal Party's trade policy is. We do not know, should it have the opportunity to form a government some time in the future, what its position is with respect to the NAFTA. It says it would renegotiate it but of course it gives no indication what the implications of that renegotiation would be. Would it accept it or not?

• (1535)

It is the same with the GST. We have never seen such waffling as we saw from the Leader of the Opposition on the GST. First he was going to scrap it, then he was going to keep it, then he was going to modify it. The latest position of the Liberal Party as I understand it is to get elected and then set up a committee to figure out what to do.

Let us talk in a realistic manner. Any party that wishes to replace this government should at least tell the Canadian people what it would do.

My hon. friend was playing with figures and I just jotted down a couple of the things he said. He talks about the recent tour of the Prime Minister which has been puffed up by the media in this country as costing \$1 million. That shows the limited research that is done. If anybody looked into it or used access to information to find out, he or she would realize that the cost of that tour was borne by the countries that hosted the Prime Minister. That is how tours by heads of government are funded. This was no million dollar tour. Unfortunately, there are no million dollars to save because there were no million dollars spent.

**Mrs. Maheu:** How much was spent.

**Mr. McCreath:** My hon. friend brings up the old chestnut of the helicopters. It is going to solve all the problems. First of all I would remind him it is a \$4.4 billion and not a \$5.8 billion expenditure spread over 13 years. The savings that would be accrued if we scrapped that contract would be 1 per cent of the deficit per year. We would have to add the cost of refurbishing the Labradors and the various helicopters that are there now, which in the short term would cost the Canadian taxpayers just as much. Then five or 10 years down the