

*The Budget*

We have entered into the free trade deal and there have been casualties. Why has this government failed to retrain those individuals so that we can once again compete?

The question is quite simple: Why does the member accept this budget, a budget with no vision for the future, and why does he stand to try to defend the indefensible?

**Mr. Reimer:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the member was listening very well because I clearly said what three other people were saying, not what I was saying, in response to this budget and the future.

The Retail Council said: "This will stimulate consumer spending". Obviously the member was not listening. I also quoted from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association that said: "This will improve the investment climate in Canada". Obviously he was not listening. I also quoted from John Bulloch who said: "I think we can be pretty hopeful that jobs will be more secure". He went on to say: "I think there is more to be happy about than pessimistic".

That is what this budget is doing and what people think it will do into the future. If it truly does stimulate consumer spending, as I went on in other details that I offered, then that will in fact create more jobs, that will create more hope, and that will create more work for the younger people.

I also mentioned that it goes on to help people in post-secondary education and therefore that too would provide for a greater and more trained and educated labour force for the future. All of those speak to the future. Obviously the member was not listening.

We have to put all of these things together, and we will.

I will just quote one more. The International Monetary Fund predicts that Canada will have the strongest economic growth rate of the Group of Seven major industrialized nations in 1992: 3.8 per cent after inflation. That is the best of all of the Group of Seven. Similar predictions have been made by the OECD and by the Conference Board of Canada.

With regard to the future, it is not just my opinion but it is also the opinion of these three boards and the three people I quoted who all said there would be greater hope and therefore more jobs into the future.

**Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus on a bit of news that the member gave us. If my note was correct, he told us that the Prime Minister had donated—I think that was the term—\$55,000 for food consumed at 24 Sussex for the past seven and a half years. My quick arithmetic indicates that is almost \$7,000 a year or almost \$600 a month that the Prime Minister is contributing toward his own food, drink or other things consumed at 24 Sussex.

Was the member trying to tell us that was the total amount the Prime Minister and his family were spending on groceries or that is what the Prime Minister thought would be a fair amount? Given his salary of I believe \$165,000 a year, I think most Canadians would feel the Prime Minister might pay for all of his groceries. Would the member tell us just what exactly he was getting at with what he announced as a revelation for the House this afternoon?

**Mr. Reimer:** Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the question from the member for Edmonton Southeast. First it was not given back. It was a reimbursement, which was the word I used. It was for \$55,115. If he wishes I could give him the exact amount for each year from April 15, 1985 of \$4,000 through to June 19, 1991 of \$4,566. I do not think I should take the time now to list what was given back in each of the other years.

In each of these years this was for the food consumed by himself and his family or his personal guests, not official guests who would go there. That would be a cost to the Government of Canada and the people of Canada. These were for his own personal costs.

I think the hon. member would agree that what is significant about that is: When have we seen that before from any other Prime Minister of Canada?

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to commend the hon. member for Kitchener on having the courage to defend the indefensible. Not only did he defend the GST, not only did he defend the free trade agreement, but he also went so far as to defend the Conservative government. For that he deserves credit. He also deserves credit for being one of the 11 per cent of Canadians who believe that this government is doing a good job.