Supply

department of government was favouring one location and another department was favouring another. They were working at cross purposes to the point where a multimillion dollar redevelopment project for the Charlottetown waterfront was being undermined by the Department of Public Works and a sister department, namely that of Regional Economic Expansion, had already invested millions and millions of dollars into the Charlottetown waterfront project.

In my speech I was making the point that it is terribly important for the left hand to know what the right hand is doing and to co-operate with one another. Time and again in departments of the federal Government we have seen one department doing one thing and another department doing something entirely different. They work at cross purposes to each other. I used the DVA location as an illustration of the point in question. We need harmony between departments within the same government and between federal and provincial governments. During the 16 years in which the Prime Minister has been in office, we have had discord rather than harmony, confrontation rather than co-operation. I think that is at the very heart of the problem with regional development policies in the country.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions if I have time. Where does the Hon. Member stand on the free trade issue? If we move toward freer trade with the United States and other countries, how will that affect Atlantic Canada?

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, I think a bit of history is in order here. When Prince Edward Island and the other Atlantic provinces were colonies, in their hey-day they had a good deal of what was analogous to free trade, largely between themselves and what is now the northeastern tier states to the south. When national tariff policies in Canada were devised under the national policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, and by every successive federal Government, the trade was artificially rerouted from north-south, as far as the Atlantic region was concerned, to east-west.

That is one of the prices that the Atlantic region has been prepared to pay to be part of the Canadian family. However, if we are to pay that price we must also get some compensatory advantages, for example, through freight rate policies. Instead, freight rate policies, which have been so important to trade, have gutted the advantages we once enjoyed. There are other examples of successive Canadian governments, mostly of a Liberal stripe, undermining our efforts to enhance our trade relations, not just with other countries, but even with other jurisdictions within Canada.

I myself am not a free trader, although I think there are some areas in which we can relax tariff and non-tariff barriers alike. However, I think that if we in the Atlantic region are going to pay the price of high tariffs in the country, there should be some corresponding advantages and those advantages have been in short supply, Sir.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a further general question. It seems to me that if

there is one Party in the House which is committed to survival of the fittest, to what is called social Darwinism, it would be the Conservative Party. It seems to me that Party would be the least committed to egalitarianism. How does the Member square that philosophy of modern conservatism with a policy of making special provision for the Atlantic region rather than abandoning it to fend for itself, as is traditional conservative policy? That is what modern conservatism is.

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, the premise of the question is totally erroneous.

Mr. Crosbie: Moronic.

Mr. McMillan: No member of this caucus or of the Progressive Conservative Party who could rightly call himself a Conservative in the country has advocated or ever fought for social Darwinism, the survival of the fittest among individuals, governments, or for that matter countries. I am proud to be associated with the record of Sir John A. Macdonald who did not hesitate to use the instruments of the state for the advantage of society as a whole, sometimes against the interests of the individual. I am proud to be associated with the record of Sir Robert Borden and Arthur Neighen, who forged some of the nation-building links which were inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald himself through the creation of the CNR. That was no lily-livered approach to stateism, Sir. I am proud to be associated with the record of John Diefenbaker who, in some ways, was the father of modern medicare through specific initiatives that he took.

There are other examples which could be cited at the provincial level. These include Leslie Frost, John Robarts and William Davis in Ontario. Look at the record of Richard Hatfield in New Brunswick. Has the Province of New Brunswick ever hesitated, in modern times, to use the instruments of the state for the advantage of society as a whole, sometimes against, perforce, the interests of the individual when the two were in conflict? I could cite similar parallels with the record of the province of which I am a resident.

The Progressive Conservative Party has a proud tradition of compassion and sensitivity to the welfare, the problems and the aspirations of individuals and provinces alike. For the Hon. Member to stand and ask the kind of question which he has asked reveals only that he does not know the history of the Conservative Party and, what is worse, does not know the history of Canada, either at the federal or provincial level.

Mr. Crosbie: He knows nothing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there further questions or comments? The House will now proceed to debate.

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I enjoyed that exposé on Conservative philosophy. I have always known that Conservatives really cannot afford to believe in the survival of the fittest. If they did, of course, they would disappear.

Mr. Crosbie: You are having a job to survive.