

Supply

foundland and Ottawa over the offshore. In other words, Newfoundland is being punished because it is standing up for its rights with respect to the control of offshore resources.

The author says that in constant dollar terms DREE expenditures in the Atlantic region fell—f-e-l-l—by 41.2 per cent between 1970-71 and 1977-78. Elsewhere in Canada they increased by 5.9 per cent. In the area that needs the money most, spending declined 41.2 per cent in constant dollars while elsewhere in Canada spending increased. Why? Because the DREE funds to overcome regional disparity were grabbed like they were garbage and scattered across Canada in other areas which the Government controls and where it thought it would do it more political good—in Quebec, Ontario and across the country. The money was no longer going to the areas that really needed it. By any objective standard it was just used as a grab bag across this country. That is what has happened, Mr. Speaker, and this article proves it.

He goes on to say that the Atlantic Provinces continue to be not only the relatively most disadvantaged provinces in Canada, but also the provinces which individually and collectively have the least ability to influence federal policy. That is obvious, Mr. Speaker. The representatives from those four provinces are the ones who have the least ability to influence federal policy. The votes are in central Canada, this is a government based in central Canada, and it does not give a good hoot about what happens in the “peripheral” regions of Canada. He quotes the late David Alexander of Memorial University who said that there must be some reason for having a country other than to provide a common market. It is possible, he said, to have a common market without having a country.

There must be some reason, Mr. Speaker, for this being one country. We in the Atlantic Provinces do not want to be just providing a market for the goods from central Canada. You can have a common market without having a country, so there has to be some other reason for our being a country other than just to provide a market for central Canadian goods, and for transfer payments so we can buy central Canadian goods.

The author says that a commitment to regional development in Canada and the sense of belonging to a country constitute a two-way relationship. Nationhood implies a commitment to development for all regions. A desire to develop a region may help to create a commitment to nationhood. That is a statement that I absolutely agree with, Mr. Speaker. This is an article worth perusal by any Member of this House. It supports our motion and the truth of our motion.

Just let me now look at Newfoundland and the punishment this Government meted out to Newfoundland because of its political dispute with the Government there. In 1979-80 it reached a high point: \$76.2 million in spending. The next year, 1980-81, \$46.5 million; 1981-82, \$36.8 million spent under DREE; 1982-83, \$34.9 million; 1983-84, \$31.4 million. The estimate for the present year is \$28 million. This is not just because the old programs were running out; the Government of Canada would not enter into new programs with the Government of Newfoundland because it wanted to punish New-

foundland for daring to stand up for what it felt to be its rights.

A ten-year general development agreement was signed in 1974. The federal Minister responsible for DREE said that \$1 billion would be spent under that program. But all that was actually spent under that agreement and the 23 subsidiary agreements was \$500 million, just 50 per cent of the expenditure level promised in 1974. Why? Because this Government decided to punish Newfoundland for taking an independent attitude on the offshore. That is why, Mr. Speaker.

In January, 1980 the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) went to Newfoundland to campaign. He said that the main message in the campaign is that to keep Newfoundland growing they have to get rid of the Crosbie Budget. That is what he said, Mr. Speaker. Well, they got rid of the Crosbie Budget that would have let Newfoundland grow. What happened in 1983? Why, the gross domestic product of Newfoundland was 2 per cent lower in real terms than it was in 1980. Unemployment in Newfoundland in 1980 averaged 13.3 per cent while we were in office and we had the Crosbie Budget. What did it average last year? Some 18.8 per cent. What is it in April of this year? Some 19.6 per cent. So much for the Prime Minister's guff that to keep Newfoundland growing we have to get rid of the Crosbie Budget. If we had had the Crosbie Budget, Newfoundland would have been growing today as it would have grown for the last four and a half years.

He then went on to say that they have not let Newfoundland down in the past and they will not in the future. All that Prime Minister has done for the last four and a half years is let Newfoundland down.

What was the fourth plank of the Liberal economic platform in the election? It was to build greater economic strength in each region of the country as the basis for over-all Canadian prosperity. That was the commitment. Has the Government done that? No, it has done away with DREE and replaced it with DRIE, and reduced its spending and efforts in the past at overcoming regional disparity. I mentioned the Senate report *Government Policy and Regional Development* which pointed out the weaknesses in the present program but I do not have time to refer to it again.

In September, 1983 the Premier met with the Minister who spoke today. They agreed upon ten initiatives on which subsidiary agreements should be concluded over the last year. Only two of the agreements were signed, covering minerals and planning; there are eight outstanding. Rural development, not signed; pulp and paper mill modernization, not signed; transportation, not signed; ocean industries, not signed; tourism, not signed; agriculture, not signed; Burin Peninsula development fund, not signed; fisheries infrastructure, not signed. That is why there is only going to be \$28 million spent in Newfoundland this financial year under the whole DRIE program. It should at least be \$140 million to remain at the same level of effort as 1979-80.

The Government is not signing programs and I can give instance after instance. Here is an instance of the federal Government ignoring the provincial government. There is no