

### Supply

What could be more interventionist than the Hon. Member's own motion? He claims that his motion is to condemn the Government for undermining the will of Parliament and the provincial legislatures by taking interventionist steps.

As this debate proceeds, I hope the Hon. Member will clarify, if it is possible for him to do so, the obvious conflict between his motion and the words that he uttered.

I find it rather amazing how representatives from the Official Opposition can so quickly forget the past. It is amazing how quickly they can get so worked up about the present. They totally forget that most of what they are rehashing is the result of the policies they had in place for over 14 years.

● (1140)

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member said that there has been no consultation. In fact, he looked at the ceiling in a quizzical way and asked, "Who is this Government talking to? Is it the provincial Premiers? No. Is it business? No. Is it labour? No". What the Hon. Member has totally ignored is that his Government was the one that instituted the concept of going into programs on a unilateral basis and of saying that the Government will not only not talk with the provinces but will move into their provincial areas of responsibility and unilaterally change things, knowing that it is not welcome.

As far as consultation is concerned, I need only remind Hon. Members that on January 21 in Ottawa, we had a meeting of all of the development Ministers in Canada. The development Ministers from the 10 provinces, the two Territories and the federal Government met at that time, and, much to everyone's pleasure, what took place at that meeting was an excellent dialogue, discourse and meeting of the minds. At that meeting, it was pointed out that that was the first time in Canadian history that there had ever been such a meeting of development Ministers from all levels of Government. How can the Hon. Member say that there is no consultation when the former Government, after 14 years, failed to have one such meeting and when we, within the first few months of governing, were able to organize successfully the initial meeting?

In fact, the meeting was so successful that we had a further meeting on March 25 in Quebec City. Again, that meeting was successful. We started to explore questions like how we can take the IRD Program to which the Hon. Member referred and make it more effectively delivered in conjunction with the provinces. We asked how we could make it more responsive to what presumably were the provincial and regional requirements. The provinces, the federal Government and the Territorial Governments are now working on those questions and hopefully will be able to come to an agreement that will be to the liking of all concerned.

Again, the meeting in Quebec City resulted in an agreement to meet in Vancouver on May 27. At that time, we hope that there will be a joint consultation paper produced. Not only will it be a federal paper but it will be a joint paper produced by the provinces, the Territories and the federal Government. Again, that will be another first for Canada. How can the

Hon. Member say that there is no consultation when the 10 provinces, the two Territories and the federal Government, for the first time, are working on such a consultation paper meant for joint publication?

The thing that I found so strange about the remarks of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry was that he said that somehow or other we are not funding enough and that we are not doing it right. He totally ignores the fact that since we took office last September, the Government has signed no less than 19 separate agreements with various provincial Governments under the IRDA mechanism. These agreements provide federal funding of nearly \$800 million to the provincial economies. Let me be a little more specific, though. Perhaps the Hon. Member cannot really relate to larger figures. Let me talk specifically. Perhaps he can understand smaller figures.

In Newfoundland, for example, on December 20, 1984, we signed a pulp and paper agreement for a total anticipated expenditure of \$46.3 million, \$38.5 million of which will come from the federal Government. On March 29, 1985, we signed a highways agreement for a total expenditure of \$180 million, \$112.5 million of which will come from the federal Treasury. In Prince Edward Island on October 26 of last year, a tourism agreement was signed for a total expenditure of \$8.9 million. In Prince Edward Island, a marketing agreement was signed with expenditures totalling \$7.5 million. In each of those instances, the federal Government is putting up approximately two-thirds of the money.

In Nova Scotia, a \$50-million fisheries agreement was signed with the federal Government putting up \$35 million. A \$14-million tourism agreement was signed with the federal Government putting up \$9.8 million. Can you really fault the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, for blushing right now? Can you really fault him for realizing how he misled this House? In New Brunswick, we signed a tourism agreement for \$32 million, \$22 million of which is coming from the federal Government. That was on November 30. A science and technology agreement was concluded on April 13, 1984, and we are continuing and expanding that agreement.

I could list the various subagreements we have signed with Quebec. Industrial development, tourism, communications, cultural infrastructures and forestry agreements have all been signed. The total of those agreements is \$830 million and the federal portion of that is \$415 million. If that sounds dramatic, one of the reasons for that is that Quebec was one of the provinces that was so severely impacted by the previous Government's unilateral actions that it refused to sign those kinds of agreements. It was not until this Government took over that we were able to sign an IRDA agreement with Quebec.

We not only succeeded in signing an IRDA agreement with the Province of Ontario on November 2 but we also concluded agreements for planning, forestry and tourism that total \$196 million, the federal portion of which is \$98 million. For the western provinces, I can cite province by province the various agreements we have signed. There are new initiatives in Saskatchewan for tourism and in Alberta for forestry. We signed