

The Budget—Mr. Minaker

three years. Give us some credit. I would appreciate his help in getting the Government to do even more.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Transport has demonstrated why many people in Canada wonder whether they always hear the whole truth from the Government.

The Minister talked about the \$60 million deal signed in Newfoundland on Monday. He did not tell us that \$42 million comes from Ottawa and \$18 million from Newfoundland.

We heard about the \$1.05 billion for ACOA, 1.05 billion times. We will probably hear it another 1.05 billion times. What we need is some progress.

We all acknowledge that the previous Government ignored Newfoundland, and that expenditures for regional development in Newfoundland decreased rather than increased over the years. We acknowledge that the Government may have replaced some of that. We know that the Minister likes to make announcements in Newfoundland, and sometimes makes each announcement several times.

I am concerned about making progress with the economic indicators for Newfoundland as compared to the rest of Canada. Again we must question the integrity of the Minister's statements when he says that we voted against moneys for regional development. He did not say that this was a \$3 billion expenditure which included \$650,000 in legal bills for the former Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion who was cited with 14 counts of conflict of interest. I suppose he would suggest that we voted against Estimates for old age pensions and therefore are opposed to old age pensions. It is comments like that by the Minister and other members of his Government which Canadians have come to expect, disregard and abhor.

The real problem with the Government is that it does not tell Canadians the real truth about what is happening in Canada. The Government announces a million dollars here or \$10 million there but does not talk about the lack of progress in reducing regional disparity.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of short and succinct questions. The leader of the Hon. Member's Party in Newfoundland, Peter Fenwick, continually misrepresents the free trade agreement and makes the most silly statements about it. The free trade agreement will be a tremendous benefit to Newfoundland.

Why does his leader in Newfoundland think that he can get away with stating that two thirds of the \$60 million funding in the five-year fishery agreement is old money, and not new money that will be spent on new marine service centres, fishery facilities, improvement of fishermen's boats and their gear, aquaculture, and a series of other programs that will be carried out over the next five years?

Why does he allow his leader of the provincial Party in Newfoundland make statements that are not only silly but

completely false? The correct figure is \$60 million, \$42 million federal and \$18 million provincial. Will he correct the record with respect to his provincial leader's statement that: "About two-thirds of it seems to be scraping up moneys that have already been in existence and just sticking them in a big pile to try to impress us"? What kind of a rational criticism of this program is that statement?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as brief as the Minister of Transport has been with his question.

I may be able to enlighten the Minister slightly with respect to the comment to which he refers. I believe the leader of the New Democratic Party in Newfoundland was trying to inform the people of Newfoundland that the money that was announced on Monday does not represent any increase from the level of spending that was taking place before. For example, in the last several years the level of expenditure which has been made in Newfoundland to upgrade fish marine centres and upgrade boats was not substantially increased. That is the point the leader of the New Democratic Party in Newfoundland was making. The announcement made by the Minister, the Premier of Newfoundland and others who gathered to sign the agreement on Monday was a little bit of smoke and mirrors in suggesting that this was \$60 million that had never been spent before. It was implied that this was new money over and above what the province had expected to receive or had spent in the last several years.

Again, we are dealing with the Government making a \$60 million announcement. The Minister finally admitted that only \$42 million of it comes from his Government. We are making some progress with the Hon. Minister, but we must recognize that the leader of the New Democratic Party in Newfoundland is informing people about the real impact of this \$60 million. It is that much of that spending had been taking place for years anyway.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate.

Mr. George Minaker (Winnipeg—St. James): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to take part in this debate, as short as it may be due to the vote to take place in five or ten minutes.

• (1740)

I think it is important to point out that we have a formula that is working. As a professional engineer, I know that when one has a formula or design which is beating the opposition and, in this case, leading the free industrial world in economic growth, one does not change the plan. You may fine tune it, but you do not change it radically as the Opposition would like to do.

I commend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) for his objective, which he stated on March 10, 1984, when he was Leader of the Official Opposition. He said at that time: "We