

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 26 February, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to introduce a change of government policy. I have here a number of copies for members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform this House that the government has changed its policy with respect to the providing of security services for government buildings. The current practice employs both in-house or Civil Service employees as well as security provided by outside contract security services. The government at this time employs 33 uniformed security officers plus six administrative personnel at five government-owned buildings. The balance of security for 12 government-owned buildings is provided by contract; security firms employing approximately 46 uniformed personnel.

The present system utilizing both in-house and contract personnel is a duplication of administration services and has two groups of employees doing the same job for unequal pay. The only way to resolve this inequality is for the government to provide security under one system — either the contract system or the Civil Service. The government has decided to bring all of the security under the operation of the Department of Government Services.

As of the 1st of April, 1982-1983, as existing contracts expire, security services formerly provided by these contracts will be provided by in-house or Civil Service employees. In 1982-1983, this will mean the hiring of 46 uniformed officers at seven government-owned buildings. Contract security firms which presently provide this service have been notified of this change and the positions have been advertised in the media. They are open for all people to apply and will be filled by normal recruitment procedure through the Department of Government Services personnel office. Persons displaced from security firms are free to apply for the positions advertised along with any other persons skilled in this type of work.

The government has taken this initiative in order to provide a continuing high quality security system for its properties. Government security employees are trained in first aid, crowd control, fire evacuation procedure and the use of government building systems. This employment practice initiated by the government is designed to provide high calibre security for its buildings. The government feels that this will be better accomplished by expanding the Civil Service

and attracting a highly trained and loyal permanent security staff.

This employment practice will be more costly than the previous practice of contracting out for this service, however, the government feels this investment in human resources will provide a high quality security service for its properties at reasonable cost. This government is cognizant of, and recognizes the legitimacy of the concerns that employee associations have expressed over the practice of contracting out as a method of skirting the collective bargaining process. This government policy, Mr. Chairman, addresses that very concern.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I notice the report that the Minister has given us regarding the new policy of the government with respect to security services seems to ignore the fact that there are various levels of security required for various types of government buildings. I imagine they will all be put in the one common pot and they will now be all equal.

One of the things that has concerned me is the fact that even though the Minister makes mention at several times about the Civil Service, I notice that the jobs that are being required are not being advertised through the Civil Service Commission. In fact, they are being advertised by the Department of Government Services.

I want to ask the Honourable Minister if these will be contract jobs or whether they will be full Civil Service jobs; whether they will be term employment; that type of information is necessary to properly evaluate the new program that the Minister has announced.

I notice that he has in his advertisement, in large letters: "An eligibility list will be established." He fails to point out who is going to establish that list; whether it's going to be done by the Civil Service Commission, or whether it's going to be done by the Premier's office, or whether it's going to be done by the Minister himself. It would be interesting to note what the qualifications are on that eligibility list and I would hope the Minister would give us that type of information.

RETURN TO ORDERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

ORDER NO. 4 - May 16, 1979

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Interlake): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table Return to Order No. 4 dated May 16, 1979. The return was mailed by the Clerk's office to the member requesting it on December 3, 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

The Honourable Minister of Labour and Finance.

ORDER NO. 14 - May 29, 1980

HON. VICTOR SCHROEDER (Rossmere): Thank you,

Mr. Speaker. I wish to table a Return to Order No. 14 of May 29, 1980. I might add this return was mailed to the member requesting it by the Clerk's office on December 3, 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. H. MACKLING (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I believe at this time of the year there is some concern about the prospects of a flood and a first report has been received by the Flood Forecasting Committee and the forecast is generally favourable, of course, it's always qualified. I intended to distribute a copy of the first forecast to the House, but through some misunderstanding I guess the news service has already taken it up. In future we will put these on the table in the House first, but it's generally a favourable forecast.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I get to Oral Questions I would like to draw the attention of members to the gallery where there is a group of 30 students of Grade 5 standing from the Constituency of Emerson. They are under the direction of Mrs. Sylvia Brule.

On behalf of all of the members I welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, given the concern of all members of the House for the stimulation and the advancement of the economy of Manitoba, and given the corroboration of that concern by the government in the Throne Speech yesterday, I should like to ask the First Minister to report to the House and to the people of Manitoba the steps that his government has taken in the past two-and-a-half to three months to ensure that Manitoba gets an aluminum smelter here which will be one of the biggest forms of economic advance that we could have in this province at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable First Minister is quite aware, there is a committee chaired by the Honourable Minister of Energy responsible for the negotiations in respect to the mega projects and I would refer the question of the First Minister to the Minister responsible for mega projects.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Government has established a joint review team with Alcan Aluminum to review all aspects of the proposed aluminum smelter in Manitoba with

out any preconditions, without any prejudgments, and that this review has been mutually agreed to between Alcan and the Manitoba Government. It is proceeding. It is proceeding without any artificial or arbitrary deadlines in order to develop the best and fairest deal for all Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the comment by the Minister I wonder if the Minister could advise if the government has dropped its precondition; namely, that no portion of a hydro plant could be sold to any aluminum smelter company. Has that rather foolish precondition that was attached by the government, has that been dropped as well?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly not the intention of the new Manitoba Government to play politics with the mega projects as seems to be the case with the Opposition. We in fact, as a government, are doing our homework as was advised by consultants to the previous government that they should do their homework before they accepted preconditions. We, in fact, are doing our homework, we are sitting down with them. We know our position, we've informed the Alcan Aluminum of our position. They know it is a strongly held position; they say they hope to convince us otherwise. We are very firm in our position but we are taking a rational, sensible approach to the review. I might note, Mr. Speaker, that it is certainly not a precondition of other companies that they have to own part of Manitoba's great heritage, namely, Manitoba Hydro, in order to proceed with developments in Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, are we entitled then to draw from the Minister's reponse that they have told Alcan that they have dropped their unusual precondition but, in fact, that they're still holding to it and that they are not negotiating in good faith?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have in fact met with the President of Alcan — it's a new President, he's come on stream since January 1st — I told him of our position, we have decided to review all aspects. We hold our position firmly; they feel they hold their position firmly; but we feel that there are ways in which their particular requirements can be met without giving up ownership of Manitoba Hydro or part of its plant. We believe that can be done; we hope to show them; they hope to try and convince us otherwise; but that's what the negotiating process is all about. I don't want to prejudice that negotiating process; I think it would be premature at this particular stage to try and make a lot of politics out of it; to try and, in fact, undermine it or jeopardize that negotiating process in any way, shape or form. That is the approach we are taking; we believe it is the rational, sensible approach that should have been taken in the past.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the First Minister again, and if he wishes to refer it to his Minister that will be his privilege, of course. Referring back to the preamble of my previous question about the need for economic stimulation in the Province of Manitoba, could the First Minister

advise what steps his government has taken to bring to a successful conclusion the negotiations with IMC with respect to the first potash mine in Manitoba?

MR. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, we have had a meeting with IMC. We are hoping to pursue discussions. There were some problems that the previous government's negotiating team had brought out with IMC; had informed the previous government. We, in fact, raised those same concerns that their negotiating team raised with IMC; we have asked them to take those concerns into consideration when they make further proposals to us. We are hoping that we will be able to proceed on that basis. We certainly believe that the potash industry in Manitoba has a future, even though the prices over the past while have dropped very significantly. We know that there is a slump in the potash market right now, but that over the course of the next two or three years that market should pick up again, if in fact the world economy picks up again, and we hope to be in a position to take advantage of that upswing. At the present stage, there is an over-capacity in potash, but we are certainly laying the groundwork in a very rational, sensible way to achieve a fair deal to enable Manitoba to take advantage of the upturn in the potash market when it takes place.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the First Minister, arising out of a statement by the Information Services reporting on his recent visit with the Premier of Saskatchewan, wherein the press statement, or the Information Service bulletin said that the Premier of Manitoba and the Premier of Saskatchewan had talked about joint ventures, possibly related to resource matters. Could the Premier of Manitoba tell the House and the people of Manitoba whether one of those joint ventures that he was discussing with the Premier of Saskatchewan might possibly have been a potash corporation, between SaskPotash and ManPotash, along the lines of ManOil?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think what is required more than ever in Canada, indeed amongst all provinces, is greater economic co-operation which appears to be going out the window, unfortunately, with respect to the whole development of co-operative federalists. So yes, in general discussion, the Premier of Saskatchewan and I discussed a number of areas by which we could mutually improve the economic and social health of our mutual provinces. I expect that we'll have continued discussions by which we can improve the quality of life of the residents of Saskatchewan and the residents of Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct my honourable friend's mind to the question. Did he discuss with the Premier of Saskatchewan the possibility of there being a joint venture on potash between the two governments?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I would be extremely unwise if I did not seize the opportunity to discuss with the Premier of Saskatchewan the possibility of joint involvement in respect to future potash

or any other kind of development insofar as Saskatchewan and Manitoba is concerned.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, now that has become public and been established, will the First Minister venture to give an opinion as to how that will affect, adversely or otherwise, the negotiations that his Minister has just said he's carrying on successfully with the other private company?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that Manitobans are most concerned about, and expressed a concern about, in November of this past year, and very very decisively, is that the previous government had indeed negotiated from weakness rather than seeking out various options, various alternatives, various tenders in order to ensure maximum return to the people of Manitoba; they settled upon one only. We are seeking out various alternatives, whether it is in respect to the aluminum industry, whether it is in respect to potash development, whether it be private, whether it be government; we are seeking out alternatives, Mr. Speaker, to maximize a return to Manitobans because that is our responsibility as a Government of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, to be specific, is my honourable friend telling the people of Manitoba that he is in the course of negotiating a Crown corporation for the exploitation of potash in Manitoba with the private sector being cut out?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition this morning that, unlike the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba that was ideologically hung up, this administration is not ideologically hung up. We are anxious to create economic stimulation in Manitoba either by way of a private sector, the co-operative sector or the public sector. Mr. Speaker, we will not shy away if, indeed, the people of Manitoba benefit from any involvement in any of those options that are available to us.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister very simply tell the House and the people of Manitoba how he can be negotiating, on the one hand, with the Province of Saskatchewan for a Crown development on potash and how, on the other hand, his Minister can be carrying on successful, as he says, negotiations with a private company for exploitation of the same resource?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

MR. PARASIUUK: In response to that question, I think the public should know that while this private company was negotiating with the previous government in Manitoba to develop a potash mine, while they were doing that, they were successfully concluding an arrangement with the Saskatchewan Government to do an expansion of a potash mine and we found ourselves having dealt with only one company while this other company was dealing with two provinces. Our options were terribly limited at that stage, Mr. Speaker. So when the Leader of the Opposition wants us to limit

our options, while allowing the other companies to have unlimited options, we put ourselves in a terrible position of weakness in trying to develop our resource in a rational, sensible way for the long-term benefit of all Manitobans.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I preface my question by merely reminding my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Energy, that we are talking about one ore body in Manitoba, not two ore bodies, one in Saskatchewan and one in Manitoba.

Reverting, Mr. Speaker, to the preliminary words that I used in the first question with respect to the need to stimulate the economy in Manitoba, can the First Minister advise this House what discussions he has undertaken with the Premiers of Saskatchewan and Alberta with respect to the successful conclusion of the Western Inter-Tie which negotiations have been going on for some three-and-a-half years and were near conclusion when we left office?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions . . .

A MEMBER: Another review.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, we indeed have been reviewing that supposed interim agreement. We've had discussions at the staff level between all three provinces; we will be having a ministerial meeting on March 15 in this respect. We, in fact, have raised concerns about some of the clauses that exist in that interim agreement and I must point out that the chief consultant to the Alberta Government in this respect said, and I quote a Canadian press report of January 28, 1982: "We certainly anticipated they would not totally endorse the agreement." That was an expectation on the part of the Alberta Government with respect to the job negotiating that the previous government had undertaken on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, which should be within the knowledge of the Honourable Minister, that the governments, the Ministers of the three provinces involved, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, recommended to their respective Premiers — back in, I believe, it was October of 1981 — that the interim agreement be approved, can my honourable friend tell the House what stage the approval discussions have reached at this time because that step had already been taken?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, neither Saskatchewan or Alberta has approved of this agreement through any formal manner through their committee process or Cabinet process. Certainly the new administration in Manitoba has been reviewing it; the previous administration had not approved it at a Cabinet level. We find, in reviewing that interim agreement, that there are some very major weaknesses from Manitoba's point of view. I do not want to table those weaknesses right now, here, because to do so would undermine the negotiations that we have to undertake. To do so would jeopardize those and, as I said before, it is not this government that will play politics with the future of the hydro development. If

they want to play politics that's up to them but it is our job to try and pursue that negotiation in good faith as we said we would do. The other two governments understand our position. We, in fact, are trying to get a sharing of uncertainty and benefits. With respect to a 35-year agreement we feel our position is a justifiable position. We've asked them to review our concerns; they have said already that they expected us to want to raise these concerns. We are negotiating a 35-year agreement that can have uncertainty and, if there is cause for concern, we will not be stampeded by some artificial deadlines, as was the previous government, which were always passed, by the way; and we are not putting up this type of mega project as any type of electoral gimmick as was done by the previous administration. We are going to take our time to negotiate this prudently, sensibly and rationally, again, for the benefit of all Manitobans for the future.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, while reminding the Honourable Minister that the so-called electoral gimmick to which he makes reference was started in the spring of 1978 which was, I think, something like six months after the 1977 election, I would say to the Honourable Minister this: If he has any material to back up his rather loose allegation about bad negotiating practices on behalf of the Western Inter-Tie by the previous government, let him put those papers and let him put those facts on the table of this House now, or withdraw his comment.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the gimmick was that the Minister agreed to the interim agreement, I think the morning or the day of the election being called in October. That was the timing of their approach with respect to the Inter-Tie Interim Agreement.

It is our position that there are some weaknesses in that agreement; we have made those concerns known in private to Saskatchewan and Alberta. We want to pursue those concerns, again, in good faith, with the assumption being that all three parties would like to negotiate an agreement that is fair to all sides, that takes into account uncertainties over a 35-year period, and takes into account benefits in an equitable manner. That is what we have put on the table with them. We hope to pursue that with them successfully. That's a delicate negotiation, Mr. Speaker. Again, we do not want to play politics with it; we aren't trying to play politics with it —(Interjection)— we are trying to pursue that in a rational way, taking the time required to negotiate it properly. That is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, we don't apologize for it.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, having regard to these delicate negotiations to which the Honourable Minister has just referred, would he mind advising the House and the people of Manitoba, who are his principal advisors and negotiators in this matter that is of such fundamental importance to the people of Manitoba?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that is an internal staff matter, but I'm quite prepared to do so, even though the previous government didn't because they didn't, in fact, believe in open government. But I'm prepared to acknowledge that the team consists of the Deputy Minister of the Department of Energy and Mines; the

previous Deputy Minister of the Department of Energy and Mines; and the present Chief Executive Officer of Manitoba Hydro. That, we think, is an appropriate team.

From time to time, Mr. Speaker, the previous government didn't draw on their internal resources, but rather farmed out negotiations to outside consultants. We believe it's far better to develop the internal resources to do the job properly, to have our homework done and to negotiate in good faith to achieve a fair deal for all people. We don't think that was done always in the past, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister, for reasons that I can't understand, seems to have some hangup about consultants or outside advisers on matters of major importance to the future of this province, would he be kind enough to advise the House as to the last previous position that was held by the present Deputy Minister of Mines and Energy and how that particularly qualifies this gentleman to be so intimately involved with these delicate negotiations.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the previous position that was held by the present Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines in Manitoba was the Secretary to the Planning Secretariat of the Cabinet of the Government of Manitoba. It was a position that was held well; his duties were performed well; and Mr. Speaker, this person has done other things since that time. I'm not going to hide things like the previous government — his position prior to coming here was to be Research Director to the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa. We are not ashamed of that, Mr. Speaker. He is a very capable person, who has experience working in the Civil Service of the Federal Government, working in the Civil Service of the Manitoba Government, working in the Civil Service of the B.C. Government. Mr. Speaker, I think we are starting off on a very wrong track if the Opposition wants to do the personal character assassination that it likes to indulge in. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that this new House would start off with some new ground rules and would not lower itself into the boorish-type of behaviour that we find coming from the other side of the House right now.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I realize my honourable friend's unfamiliarity with Parliament and with its procedures, and he will find that being a member of the government bench, whether he likes it or not, he will have to face and to answer questions, and he will find in due course that exercise is part of our parliamentary democracy and is not boorishness.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend whether or not the former Director of Research for the New Democratic Party in Ottawa ever held any government position with the province that was not governed by a New Democratic Party Government?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba and British Columbia he served New Democratic Party Governments. In fact, we are proud that he has that ability to perform that function well. I must point out that he did

serve the Federal Government. To date, I don't think that there has been a Federal Government that has been New Democratic, but soon that may take place. He served in those positions with distinction, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that all of the people of Manitoba will now be reassured that these delicate negotiations are in such finely trained hands.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister. In view of the rather bizarre and unacceptable statements made by the Prime Minister of Canada yesterday concerning his view that co-operative federalism is dead, is the First Minister now prepared to make a statement with respect to those comments and to give the House and the people of Manitoba his view after two-and-a-half months of how co-operative federalism can be carried on with this particular Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased indeed that the Leader of the Opposition has raised this question this morning. I read, with considerable disappointment this morning, the attitude of the First Minister pertaining to co-operative federalism. It is a difficult time that we're in, in Canada, economically and otherwise, and it requires both the Prime Minister and the provinces to work together in a co-operative federalist manner.

Now unfortunately, in the past period of time, two, three, four years, and sometimes longer in some instances, there has not been that kind of co-operation, either on the part of the Prime Minister or on the part of some Premiers. We are attempting, Mr. Speaker, from our vantage point, because of the critical times and because I believe there is no other alternative, no other alternative, but to travel the road of co-operative federalism, to encourage the Prime Minister to return to the path of co-operative federalism which is the best for all Canadians.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, while sharing to the full, and having practised to the full, co-operative federalism to the extent that was possible with this particular Prime Minister, can my honourable friend answer the question; namely, what is his response to a Prime Minister of Canada who says that he will act unilaterally to impose equalization conditions upon the province, equalization conditions which his Minister of Finance has already said are totally unacceptable?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to inform the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the House that my Minister of Finance has done an excellent job in working with his colleagues, other Ministers of Finance, and again and again bringing to the attention of the Prime Minister that indeed the Prime Minister is acting in contradiction of a provision which we are enshrining in the Constitution which we support; that indeed public services ought to be provided to all Canadians at comparable tax levels; that indeed by his very action he's undercutting that very very important principle.

Now, my Minister of Finance has clearly brought

that to the attention of his colleagues, the Ministers of Finance. I myself, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, have done likewise at the first Federal-Provincial Conference I had the opportunity to attend.

I do not know whether or not the damage that has been done by some years of poisonous bickering between the Prime Minister and the various Premiers of this country — some Premiers — can indeed be repaired overnight. But I know, Mr. Speaker, that we must commence that difficult task in the interest of Canadians.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, following upon the response of the First Minister and taking as I do his comment that he does not accept the Prime Minister's view about the death of co-operative federalism, would the First Minister tell us whether he is prepared to have the western Premiers or indeed the Premiers Conference of Canada consider a joint response to the Prime Minister which would incorporate, I take it, the views of the First Minister of Manitoba that the statements of the Prime Minister of Canada are indeed bizarre and unacceptable in this federal country?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that insofar as the Premiers of the western provinces, indeed the upcoming meeting of Premiers, will wish to deal with the comments and statements and the position by the Prime Minister. I think it is also important that we not just point the finger, Mr. Speaker, but that we also examine our past conduct as Premiers of this country in order to ascertain why we've reached this very, very difficult point — very, very difficult point. So, indeed when we talk about this we mean co-operation; not just co-operation on the part of the Prime Minister, but the co-operation on the part of all Premiers insofar as ensuring that those programs that are provided are done so with a minimum of desire for political credit; but let us share the credit together in order to ensure the improvement of Canadians and residents of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. It was reported in the February 24th edition of the Globe and Mail that the Federal Government's statutory payments to the provinces for post-secondary education for the fiscal year 1982-83 will be reduced by 325.2 million. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could advise the House how that will impact upon the revenues of the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the honourable member knows anytime we lose provincial revenue that impacts on our ability to provide funding for our own institutions. The numbers he has given are not the same as the numbers which were provided to the Free Press, it was a C.P. report, I believe in the same day's paper, I believe those figures

were over 500 million. There is still some confusion with respect to the specific numbers. We don't know whether the 300 million or the 500 million is the correct number that the the Government of Canada is now proposing; but as the member is aware, the Federal Government is still in the midst of negotiations with the provinces. They are now at a position where they are certainly prepared to pay somewhat more money than they were prepared to pay in the fall of 1981. They are not prepared to pay as much money as we would like them to pay but they are prepared to pay a little more and we're still negotiating and I'm still optimistic that we will convince them that they should remain with the Prime Minister's statement to the First Ministers Conference when he said that we were going to get transfer payments to the provinces from the Federal Government over the next five years which would average a 12 percent increase per year and if we get the 12 percent increase this coming year, then of course, there's going to have to be a considerable change in the federal numbers, either with the established program financing payments, or with equalization payments, or with other Federal Provincial fiscal transfers.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance indicating that although the Federal Government has said that they will be reducing the transfer payments by a specific amount, that in fact, negotiations are still proceeding?

MR. SCHROEDER: We do not believe that negotiations have been concluded. There are still discussions to be carried on by officials. Just within the last few days I suggested to the Federal Finance Minister that we have another conference to discuss further the 12 percent statement of the Prime Minister. We would love to take him up on it, as I'm sure the member knows, we would prefer to stay with the old equalization and EPF formulas, the ones that were negotiated in 1977 and commenced in 1978; that would be our first preference.

Our second preference would be for the Federal Government to agree to the agreement the provinces arrived at, at the last First Ministers Conference and I believe that was an historic agreement in that the provinces were able between them, to agree first of all to a reduction which the Prime Minister had indicated he wanted to reduce the rate of increase of payments from the 16 percent down to the 12 percent. We agreed to that; we went further and we sat down and decided how that 12 percent would be divided between the richer provinces and the poorer provinces and some provinces such as the Maritimes were to receive in the area of a 22 percent increase; some provinces such as Alberta were prepared to accept a decrease. That package was presented to the Federal Government at that time. Unfortunately it has not, to date, been accepted, but I think it is so reasonable that I'm sure at some stage it will be accepted.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that the Honourable Minister of Finance is pursuing the policy that was being pursued by the previous administration and I wish him well in view of the Prime Minister's statement — co-operative federalism is dead.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services. Will the Minister assure the House that under his capable and experienced hand, the Information Services Branch will not be used as a propaganda tool to mislead the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comment of my honourable friend opposite. I can assure him that we will revert back to the policy of the eight years of our government in the past, which was indeed a reasonable policy in the interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. RANSOM: That's what I was afraid of. But I take that assurance to mean that indeed it will not be used as a propaganda tool, Mr. Speaker, and in that case I have a question for the Minister of Finance: Would he explain to this House why he approved a misleading, confusing press release dated February 25th, which is entitled "Manitobans Can Expect Record \$289.3 Million Deficit," at the same time as the Department of Finance and the same Minister is releasing a Quarterly Financial Report which says that Manitobans can expect a deficit of \$264.3 million? Can the Minister explain that misleading, erroneous statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to explain that to the former Finance Minister. He may not remember the \$25 million that he took out of the Special Emergency Municipal Loans Fund in order that he could reduce his deficit for the year. That was a fund that had been established 30 years ago. He emptied that sock, so to speak, so that he could decrease his deficit. It is a way of doing — (Interjection) — If he doesn't know what happened, then I don't know who would, but I would refer him specifically to the first page of the report that was released, to the report he is now referring to, and I would quote the second last paragraph: "The projected deficit for March 31, 1982, before elimination of the Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund, has been revised to 289.3 million. After adjusting for the transfer of 25 million from the Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund, the projected deficit for March 31, 1982 is 264.3 million, using the most current information available."

So, Mr. Speaker, the point is this; it is made very clearly in this document that the deficit is now projected at 264 million approximately, and it is only that because the former government took \$25 million out of the special fund in order to decrease the deficit.

A MEMBER: To make themselves look good.

MR. RANSOM: The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister is juggling the figures. Let me refer him to the first page of the Quarterly Financial Report that was released at the end of September and he will see that there is no reference there to the \$25 million from the Special Municipal Loans Fund. There is a statement that says it was prepared according to

The Financial Administration Act. Why has the Minister now found it necessary to make special reference to a \$25 million revenue item which was already included within the revenues of the province? He is now attempting to make the deficit appear \$25 million larger than it really is. He is misleading the people of this province. They are using the Information Services as a propaganda tool, as the Minister of Government Services said they would do following their practice of eight years ago.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the former Minister is aware, that particular report he referred to was practically completed by the time we took office. It was no different from the report of three months before then, when no special mention was made of the \$25 million. I know he would like to forget about it. I know he would like to pretend that the 25 million was never taken out of that particular fund in order to make his government look better just into an election year. We know he would like to forget that.

We're just trying to remind the people of Manitoba that what happened in that previous period was that the \$25 million was taken out and was used to, on paper, decrease the deficit. But you know, when you take long-term funds out like that and use them for today, then what you are doing is taking money that you would otherwise have had for the future to decrease today's deficit. The honourable member was attempting to juggle the books. We are just showing the people what happened.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a Non-Political Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister have leave? (Agreed) Proceed.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members of the Assembly to join with me in congratulating the curlers from the Arthur Constituency in the Mel Logan rink, who recently won the Labatt's Tankard in the City of Winnipeg; the members of that rink being Mel Logan, Doug Armour, Lloyd Land and Al Grainger. They did a tremendous job.

I think we should also say that we were very happy to see Gary Ross, who is a tremendous curler and has been to the finals many times, from my deskmate's constituency — tremendous competition.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the Junior Girls' Curling Championship from Deloraine . . .

A MEMBER: They also beat our girls.

MR. DOWNEY: . . . a young group of girls who were skipped by Maureen Bonar — Linda Weidenhammer, Valerie Sambrook and Allison Laval. I would have to

say that the Bonar name is quite well known in the sport. She has a brother who plays for the Los Angeles Kings, so they are a tremendous tribute to the people of Arthur, I'm sure, and we want to wish them well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Laverendrye.

MR. ROBERT BANMAN (Laverendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to make a Non-Political Statement.

I'd like to ask the members of the Legislature to join with me in congratulating a rink from Steinbach, who won the Manitoba Mixed Curling Championships last week. The rink is comprised of the skip, Doug Lintott; the third, Sandra Schalla; the second, Wilf Peters, and the lead Sophie Lipinski. They will be heading out to Timmins in the month of March to participate in the Canadian Championships.

I know that all members of the House join me in wishing them the best of luck in Timmins, and hopefully, they'll bring the National Championship home to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to make a Non-Political statement also.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

A MEMBER: That's impossible.

MR. JOHNSTON: That's close to being right. Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to join me in congratulating the Dot Rose Rink from the Deer Lodge Curling Club, which is in the Constituency of Sturgeon Creek. They have won the Ladies Provincial Championship and as a matter of fact, they are leaving today to represent the province in the National Championship. The rink consists of Dot Rose, Lynn Andrews, Sharon Burns and Kim Crass. I'm sure that the calibre of curling that these girls are capable of will bring back the trophy for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, following the sports, I would like to make a non-political announcement. The weather forecast for today is a low of minus 20, a high of minus six.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the consideration of the Speech of Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Honourable Member of The Pas.

MR. HARRY M. HARAPIAK (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that an humble address be presented to Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present Session.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As is customary, I would like to begin my tenure in this Legislature by congratulating you on your election to the highest office in this Assembly. I can assure you I offer such congratulations and good wishes not only out of custom and tradition but sincerely and with great humbleness. I have always known you to be fair and impartial in your previous roles. It also should be mentioned that you bring great experience to your office, experience as a longstanding member of this Legislature and as a trusted and valued parliamentarian. I know you will continue to uphold and advance the tradition of your prestigious position. We can all do well to follow in your footsteps and to take note of your example and to heed well your words.

As a new member in this House I can assure you that I will be relying upon your advice and guidance from time to time, and if I should inadvertently stray from the rules on occasion I know you will be prompt but kind in your advice and help. I can assure you that your assistance will be accepted and appreciated as well as needed.

It is also customary that the Mover of the Throne Speech express his or her appreciation to the First Minister and the Executive Council for the honour which has been bestowed upon them. Again I can assure you that it is more than a mere custom which causes me to offer such thanks for the special privilege of moving this first Throne Speech to the new Government. It is indeed a great honour which I humbly accept on behalf of my caucus and constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the number of people who attended the pre-Session service. We should be asking for God's peace, strength, wisdom and direction as we begin this new Session.

Again, as is tradition, I wish to use my first opportunity to address the Members of the Legislature to describe the constituency of The Pas. By doing so I hope not only to pay tribute to those who have placed their trust in me but I intend as well to create a broader understanding of the issues facing those in my home area and to demonstrate the great potential of Northern Manitoba promises.

Every elected official believes that his or her constituency is the biggest, the best, and the most unique constituency in the entire country. The people are the best; the lakes are the clearest; the land is the most bountiful and all that is well needs to be well. That's what they all say. I'm not wanting to break with tradition, I can honestly tell you that the constituency of The Pas is all that and more. The people are great people and the future is a great future.

Given the recent distribution, and the changes which have affected a great number of constituencies, I also have the privilege today to introduce an entirely

new constituency to my colleagues and others who may be listening to these remarks.

Justice Tom Berger in his McKenzie Valley Pipeline Report talked about two different norths. There was the homeland for those who had traditionally lived and worked in the surrounding area; there was the frontier for those who immigrated to the area, whether recently or generations ago, in search of a new life. The constituency of The Pas is a homeland to many and a frontier to others. There are many small settlements and communities such as Wanless, Cormorant, The Pas Airport; there are many combined Metis communities and reserves such as Grand Rapids, Moose Lake, Esterville, Pelican Rapids or Shoal River. That, of course, leaves The Pas area itself with the community of The Pas and the reserve community, The Pas Reserve and the Metis settlements of Big Eddy, Umperville, Young's Point and also the farming settlements of Rall Island and the Carrot River Valley. So it is obvious the constituency is varied and exciting both in which to live and to serve.

It is an area which is rich with resources. There is a trapping industry steeped in its historical roots; it is viable and vibrant today. There is also the commercial fishing industry which also has earned a solid history of which my government both recognizes and prizes. There is the lumber industry which had a somewhat more controversial history but enjoys great untapped potential as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that agriculture plays a great part in the development of the north. A recent study has shown there are 5.7 million acres of arable land north of the 53rd parallel; there are presently 69,000 acres being farmed which produce 1.5 million bushels of grain.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest resource of our province is our people. We should not overlook or take for granted the cornerstone of our society which is our basic and traditional family unit. The family is the pride of our people. We should endeavour and encourage the support to strengthen the family in their search for better communication and richer lives. The fruits of a strong family life spills over in all aspects of our society and each of us becomes richer because of it. Good family communications, good family life, means a better community life as well.

North-south dialogue doesn't have to be just an international topic. We do not have to leave Manitoba to realize north-south dialogue is essential here as well. Why? For a better understanding and greater appreciation between our northern and southern communities. No matter how large or small they may be, I believe that this government has set the standards by its openness and willingness to meet and communicate with all its people.

Again I say the richest resource of them all must always be the people who work the lakes, industry, the bush and the fields.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the individuals who have expressed their confidence in myself as their MLA in my government. I want to publicly pledge to them that I will do all that is within my power and ability to live up to the trust and faith which they have shown in me. It has often been said in the short history of my government that a new government is a different government, a government that intends to open its

doors to those who rely upon the wisdom and the ability of their legislators. I am proud to be a part of this new style of government because I believe so strongly in that basic principle of openness.

I know that my constituents can play a valuable role in the development and implementation of good and sound government programs. I am looking forward to their advice and their suggestions and, when necessary, to their criticism and their critiques.

In a few short months, since the last election, I have met with many groups and talked to hundreds of individuals. We have talked about those matters which concern us the most; we have talked about jobs and more often about the need for more jobs. We have schemed and dreamed about more efficient uses of our natural resources. We have discussed serious and urgent problems and considered options and solutions, and in every instance I have been impressed by the sincerity and thoroughness of those discussions. I have learned to trust and rely upon the wisdom that comes from firsthand knowledge and the realism that comes from a sincere desire to build a better world and to improve upon all our conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we truly are a province of great people, but great people are only half of that equation; we need as well to create an environment in which we can achieve our potential, in which we can all achieve greatness.

We must build on our own great future, which brings us to the Throne Speech itself. It is a blueprint for that future. It speaks of programs, principles and potential. If I had the time, I would address each of its parts in the detail deserved, however, I shall have to be content to leave much of that detail to my colleagues. For the time being I want to place that Throne Speech in the context of my own constituency and Northern Manitoba.

I had mentioned earlier, the North being both a homeland and a frontier, my government values both of these norths. The Throne Speech is quick to acknowledge the proud tradition of Native people, but it goes well beyond that important statement of principle. Throughout its entirety this outline for legislative action addresses the needs of those Manitobans of our proud Native heritage.

We know that all Manitobans need and want to be productive. We reject categorically any suggestion such as was stated by the previous government that welfare in the north is in any way better than gainful jobs and we know as well that Native northerners have not always had the same opportunity as others to find gainful employment. For that reason we proudly state our intention in the Throne Speech when we commit ourselves to continued efforts to increase accessibility to training and employment for women, Native people and other northerners, whose historical access to employment and jobs has been severely limited.

We know there are many paths which will lead us to this goal. We will look to our Crown corporations to provide many of those jobs and to lead us by their example.

We are actively negotiating a new Northlands Agreement, so as to provide that added emphasis to economic development in Northern Manitoba and to the realization of the North's full potential.

We also realize that the North can never truly be

strong until we have strong local governments in every community, regardless of their location or their size. Again my government's Throne Speech spells out this commitment to the future of Northern Manitoba, but Native people throughout the countries and this province also have much to say about the way in which we govern this land. That is why my government has committed itself to the true involvement of Manitoba's Native people when aboriginal rights are discussed at the Constitutional Conference Table.

As well, we are now in the process of moving towards a fair and equitable resolution of the many Native land claims which have been unresolved for far too long. The first steps in that process will be the establishment of a Native Land Claim's Commission which will address these outstanding claims from an impartial and a comprehensive perspective.

I sincerely believe that the Indian and Metis people of my own constituency and throughout the province are looking forward to working with this government to build the type of society by which we will all share and benefit from our rich history and our strong ties with each other.

There is another part to The Pas Constituency, that is the industrial north. My government's Throne Speech speaks well of these needs. We have already stated our intention, that special efforts be made to ensure that Native people and northerners benefit fully by any northern development.

We also know that such development will depend in large part in the rational use of our rich and bountiful resources. My government and I know and believe that the people of this province want to be a part of that development; they want to become masters of their own house, so, we are not afraid to use public investment as a vehicle to spark economic activity and to encourage private investment in Manitoba.

We have already created a Department of Crown Investments which will allow for the most effective and co-ordinated use of our financial resources to begin to build our own future. We are prepared to invest in that future by investing in our natural resources through innovative and imaginative mechanism, such as the newly announced Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation.

As well, we are going to continue to enter into joint ventures with willing partners in the private sector, such as has been done at Trout Lake, where a paying copper mine is in initial stages of development, largely because of the foresight of the government of many years ago. Now Manitobans are about to reap the benefits of that foresight and courage; it is a lesson we shall not forget.

Mention is also made in the Throne Speech before you of an ongoing review of the expansion of the Manitoba Forest Resources Limited.

We all know that ManFor has experienced serious difficulties as a result of a general downturn in the industry and the refusal of the previous government to deal effectively with the mounting inventory.

In The Pas, especially, we know firsthand of the hardship their lack of leadership has created. We also know firsthand of the difficult decisions which face the new government, and while all of us would have preferred to have been able to take other actions, the critical nature of the current levels of inventory of

lumber threaten the long-term viability of the ManFor Complex. This government was not afraid to act.

So while the decisions were tough ones to make, there are few who would suggest that they were not the right ones, given the circumstances. I think most will also agree that the open and honest way by which government dealt with this problem provides an example for both the private and the public sector.

I truly believe that the efforts which this government has undertaken to protect the future of this operation, and to protect the public investment in the ManFor complex, will result in an expanded and enhanced forestry industry in Northern Manitoba. We will define this practical and concrete example as we develop measures and procedures to offset the harmful effects of many one-industry communities which result from the cyclical nature of resource industries.

So our approach in the development of natural resources in Northern Manitoba and throughout the province is a rational and productive one. We are not afraid to use Crown corporations to ensure that all Manitobans profit from this development. We are prepared to provide the mechanism and the necessary support to ensure that all northerners, and Native northerners in specific, take full advantage of this economic activity and an opportunity for gainful employment.

Finally, we recognize that the resource sector is a cyclical sector. We are prepared to ensure that government can deal with the downturns and their effects on both the communities and the people. We also recognize and value the historical industries such as fishing and trapping. While their structure and operation may differ greatly from other resource development, my government is aware of their great value and their profound historical significance. More importantly, we are prepared to offer that support which is possible to ensure these industries future viability.

Before concluding my remarks with the customary motion, Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly address the Throne Speech from a very personal perspective. I have talked much, as my government's Throne Speech does, about jobs and employment. I now want to talk a bit about my own job and the effect of the Throne Speech on it. I have been a railroader now for 18 years. I have worked in the North and on northern runs for all of those 18 years. During that employment, I have often been to Churchill in many different capacities. I know firsthand of the potential of that Port; I know firsthand of the importance of the Port of Churchill and the Hudson Bay route to the economic health of this province, so I commend personally to you the strong statement of support that this Throne Speech contains for the Port of Churchill. I know this commitment is one that every member of this Chamber — regardless of their political stripes — wish to see fulfilled.

As well as a railroader, my wife and I are the parents of five children, three daughters and two sons. My youngest son is handicapped and he is very special to me and he's also very special to all of us. Because he is handicapped, he has special needs. He also has special strengths. He is talking much about myself and about our world. I believe very strongly that all handicapped people bring a special quality to this world. They enable us — they force us — to look at ourselves

and our society from a different perspective. For that reason, they are to be cherished for their unusual strengths and need to be helped a great deal with their weaknesses. We all have those weaknesses; it is just that the weaknesses of the handicapped are a little more visible, and a little more demanding. That is why I'm especially pleased to see, although the Year of the Disabled has come to an end, the Province of Manitoba continues to recognize the needs of the physically and mentally handicapped. If for that recognition alone, I would be honoured to move this Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. CONRAD SANTOS (Burrows): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I'd like to congratulate the Premier and the members of his Cabinet for providing an enlightened leadership to the Province of Manitoba.

I'd like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for gracefully accepting this position of honour, and I'd also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker.

Next, I'd like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for the commendable orderliness in the transition of power after the people in this province had expressed a general mandate for a change in government in a general election.

I also want to congratulate all the newly elected MLAs and also, of course, the re-elected MLAs, and wish them all the good best in all the forthcoming sessions to come.

Finally, I'd like to extend my gratitude to the people of my constituency, the Constituency of Burrows, who had always, through thick and thin, given their full-hearted support for a party that now represents a great people with a great future.

After going through a hectic campaign in the provincial Constituency of Burrows, I took the time and patience in listening to all the feelings and sentiments of the residents and the electorate and the people of Burrows. I interacted with them; I listened to all they had to say — their gripes against the bureaucracy, against the government. I have had serious communion with the people, such that it transformed myself. I began to think the way they think; I began to feel the way they feel; I began to believe the same beliefs and ideas they have, that I now feel competent myself to represent this wonderful people of the Constituency of Burrows.

We, the people of Burrows, have discovered one of the secrets in life, and it is that we should not all the time keep on going and trying to do what we always want to do, but we must be doing those things that we ought to do. We have recognized the importance of duty in life.

We, in the Constituency of Burrows, consider life like a big, grinding stone. It grinds us down, or could pulverize us, or it could polish us up, depending on the kind of materials we are made out of, but we are made out of granite rocks, Mr. Speaker. The more life grinds us, the more we come out like shiny peoples worthy to be jewels in the crown of this country.

The people of Burrows recognize the need for economic upliftment and development of this country. There are many people in my constituency who need

jobs and there are no jobs, but our government will do its share in providing all the opportunities to enhance the development of our province. The people of my constituency have learned how to live with less and less. We begin to appreciate what we have and do whatever we can do with what we have. We have no complaints; we are beginning to conquer even worry in the midst of our needs and we are beginning to escape the envy of those others more favoured. We begin to appreciate that life is like a long winding road, the end of which we cannot see. Sometimes it passes through rivers and valleys, sometimes the high, bumpy, hilly places and also sometimes the wasteland of the lowlands as well. We begin to understand and appreciate that life is not just a state of being, life is an exciting process of becoming.

I would like to go now, Mr. Speaker, to the heart of what I am going to say. I would like to focus now on the perennial issue that plagues all governments, all Democratic governments, and it is the issue of how to make government responsive, rational and responsible in a democratic society like ours which is rapidly becoming multi-ethnic and multi-cultural. Mr. Speaker, I ask again, how can we make the Government of the Province of Manitoba more responsive to the needs of the people? I would like to attempt to answer that question. The answer I believe lies in the representativeness of the government, in other words, I'm saying that representativeness is a precondition to responsiveness of any government to its own people. If the population mix in the society has changed, as it obviously has changed in the past, then accordingly the government must correspondingly change to properly reflect the population mix in society. Only then will the government, particularly the public bureaucracy, be able to understand the sentiments, hopes, dreams and aspirations of the various segments of its population so as to be able to properly respond to it. Representativeness is a precondition to responsiveness and if we make our government truly a mirror image of its own people it certainly will be a most responsive government.

I now come to my next question, how do you make that responsive government rational, rationally competent enough to provide . . . fulfilling function towards all its people? The answer I think lies in ourselves in this Legislative Assembly, particularly those of us who are occupying positions of responsibility by being Members of the Cabinet. We must see to it that we select to become a member of the public bureaucracy; only those people who are competent, who have the knowledge, the skills, the training, the ability so that they would be able to understand the nature of the task they are supposed to do and be able to carry out that task in the way it should be done. But competence alone is not enough, there is nothing more dangerous than a body of whiz kids who are morally bankrupt. I say that we must not only get competent people but we must also get people who are upright, with integrity as individuals. It is this personal integrity, Mr. Speaker, that makes a competent civil servant responsible. Without integrity he can be affected but he will not be responsible. It is a commitment of this government to an ethics of public morality that will make the Government of the Province of Manitoba a truly responsible government.

But what, some people may ask, has morality got to do with politics? What has morality to do with this ongoing continuing struggle for political power between persons and groups in our society? What has morality to do with this contest of personalities, skills, talents between and among people, in determining through the electoral process who gets what, when, where and how? Mr. Speaker, the answer is this. Without a commitment to ethics of public morality those who occupy positions of authority and positions of power are prone to two weaknesses of humankind; weakness to boost their egotism so that they become arrogant or they succumb to wrongdoing so that they become susceptible to human degradation which we call corruption. Lord Acton of Great Britain said it long time ago, "Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely." There is nothing more pernicious and more dangerous in the long run to ourselves as individuals and to society in general, than this tendency towards human corruption because it eats away the moral fibre of initially good and honest men and corrodes and destroys the strands of stability that have crystallized throughout the ages to form the civilized framework of our society by which we can responsibly exercise power and exercise the rights and liberties of people.

Mr. Speaker, the answer, an antidote to the tendency towards arrogance and towards corruption, is a commitment of this government to an ethics of public morality in government. But ideas alone are not enough, those ideas must be translated into options if they are to affect reality in the world in which we live. So we are translating our ideas of a commitment to public morality into a proposal for a conflict of interest legislation. We are going to put into action the ideas so that they will operate to change the face of reality and improve the kind of government that we have had in the past.

There was a statesman a long time ago by the name of Sir Robert Walpole. He was known to have been an effective statesman because he knew the strength and weakness of man. During one of Sir Robert Walpole's administrations he approached a member of the House of Commons and putting a large bank note in the member's hand said, "I need your vote today," and the member of the House of Commons smiled and said, "Sir Robert, you have been very good to my friends, you have done them favours, you have been most gracious to my wife because you have introduced my wife to the King; therefore, and putting the bank note into his pocket, the member replied, "I would consider myself ungrateful if I refuse now what you are asking me to do."

Mr. Speaker, to give meritoriously is to honour appropriately, but to give too much is to corrupt unmercifully.

We need a responsible government, not only for the present, but for all times to come. What do I mean by a responsible government? What is meant by responsibility in government? Responsibility means it is a government that is accountable. It means accountability, accountability in the sense of being answerable to someone or to somebody. Responsibility in government means answerability, accountability, with a susceptibility to rational explanation of all its actions and decisions in the sense that there is an honest and

sincere attempt to get all the factual information, to consider all the alternative courses of action and all the consequences after serious and long deliberation; only then, shall it make the choice and implement the action — that will be a responsible government.

Responsibility in government also means that we should not be in a hurry in doing anything that later on we cannot undo. Just as in private life, it is also true in public life — haste makes waste — but reasonable caution is not the same as lack of action. As a government we have embraced a philosophy of activism in government. Activism in government means that we take initiative; we take initiative to pursue dishonourable social objectives; we take initiatives even in changing established institutions and practices if it will be for the betterment of humankind.

Activism in government also means that we shall always do what is appropriate and honest and moral and virtuous and for the good of all the people of this province, not just for the good of particular individuals or particular corporations or particularistic interest; but activism in government requires power and unhampered discretion. Without power no government can be effective to carry out its purposes, but plus we have said, there is the inherent risk of power and that is the tendency to succumb to egotism and corruption, but because we have a commitment to an ethics of public morality we know that the exercise of power will not be irresponsible. As Woodrow Wilson has stated a long time ago, "there is no danger in power, only a power is responsible."

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to wind up now by stating what I have said. I'd like to conclude by summarizing what I have said. First, I said, before any government can be responsive such a government must be representative, representative in the sense that it is the mirror image of the people that it is supposed to serve.

Second, not only must the government be responsive and representative, such a government must also be rationally competent and service fulfilling to meet all the needs of the people; and finally, not only must the government be responsive and representative, not only must the government be representative but such a government must also be responsible; but it can only be responsible if it has a solid commitment to an ethics of public morality. It is public morality that makes powerful people responsible; it is public morality that makes government responsible.

I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. Monday afternoon.