

coming. That is what we are fighting. Right here, now, today, we are fighting the next election. My policy, and I have gone through five elections, has always been to fight the next election the day after the last one is over. What we are doing here today is fighting the next election. We will see what is going to happen in four years' time. The people of Canada have chosen. I give the Hon. Member credit. We will see what happens in four years' time. I tell the Hon. Member now, as I told the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) the other day, that if his Government pursues this policy he will see that he will not be back on that side of the House in four years' time. If the Hon. Member for St. John's West believes that, I say to him again, as I said to him the other day: "Come now, debate with me in my riding. Run against me in four years' time and we will see who wins".

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Member. We hear so frequently from Conservative Members of Parliament about the tremendous advantages of the private sector and we hear criticisms of the public sector. My friend, the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay), just spoke about some of Canada's make-work projects as if that were bad. Would the Hon. Member take a few moments and explain what happened in the fishing industry on the East Coast? My impression is that private sector companies were going bankrupt, that there were so many people working in the industry that governments, not socialist governments but the federal Liberal government, and one or two provincial Conservative governments, had to step in and make it, at least in part, a public enterprise. Maybe the Hon. Member could give us a few details on that.

Mr. Rompkey: I alluded to that in my speech, Mr. Speaker. It is a good question. That is virtually what happened. The private sector was in trouble across the board. Some of the smaller companies are doing very well, but the major companies in Atlantic Canada were in real trouble. Most of them, with the exception of National Sea Products, were on the verge of bankruptcy, not because of either a Conservative, Liberal, or NDP government or the fishermen, or the stocks, or anything like that; it was their inability to compete in the marketplace with the Scandinavians and others. The private sector was just not doing the job. Both governments, the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, are in a partnership to try and do that particular job.

I made the point, and the point has been made again, that while I support, by and large, the theory that it has to be the private sector, and particularly small business, which creates long-term jobs, you have to question certain areas, particularly the one which the Hon. Member mentioned. The private sector's track record does not lead us to believe that it is going to do the kind of excellent job that we hope the private sector is going to be able to do.

I would like to take one more minute to speak about the fishermen. The situation for fishermen is even worse in some areas of the country. When the Hon. Member talks about devastation—and I raised this problem with the Minister of

Borrowing Authority

Employment and Immigration—there are in-shore fishermen in Newfoundland this year who will not get any benefits at all. In the community of Griquet, for example, on the northern peninsula of Newfoundland, there are probably 100 such fishermen. Probably the total fishing force of that community will not qualify for an employment insurance because the fish did not come.

This is something you have to appreciate about fishing. It is not quite the same as farming. First, there are not the same safety nets. Second, we are equally vulnerable to the kinds of hazards nature inflicts upon us. This year was a staggering year for the in-shore fishermen. Instead of cutting unemployment insurance, what the Government should be doing is instituting special programs to help those fishermen who are affected.

Mr. Nickerson: I have a question for the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey). His presentation dealt almost exclusively with decrying the Government for trying to put some realism into the national finances and therefore having to cut back on some expenditures. He exhorted the Government to spend even more money, especially in his particular area. Do I take it that the position of the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador and the Liberal Party of Canada is that \$23 billion of new borrowing authority is not enough, that they would prefer perhaps \$50 billion of new borrowing authority, money that would then at some point in time have to be repaid with interest?

Mr. Rompkey: It is not my job to propose, Mr. Speaker. That is the Government's job. My job as a representative is to stand here in the Chamber and to say what effect the policy of the Government is going to have on my people. That is the duty of the Hon. Member as well. I would say to the Hon. Member that the increase in the fuel tax, the increase in airport fees and the other measures to be taken will be just as devastating in the Western Arctic as Labrador. I do not know how he is going to explain that to his people but I would not want to have to explain it to mine.

Mr. Baker: I have a comment and I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. I have to congratulate the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) on talking about the importance of having direct job creation programs, as he said, in rural areas, high unemployment areas. It appears to be a fixation with this Government to treat everybody across the country alike. As the Hon. Member said, they are doing away with direct job-creation programs.

We had an intervention from the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay). The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) "didn't understand it at all. He said the Minister of Employment and Immigration will be developing new programs to provide permanent jobs for our youth. Therefore, the Summer Canada program will as a result be terminated".

How stupid, Mr. Speaker. You do not give a student looking for a job for the summer a permanent job. What he is really referring to is private enterprise. Private enterprise does not