

tion, two qualities which are quite new at the federal level. The electoral decision of last September was quite clear: The voters had enough of this mish mash of systematic confrontation and organized discord! We now work in a harmonious climate which is quite appropriate in a federal administration. We sincerely believe that this new reality has not been fully understood yet by the Members opposite, especially the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry and his colleagues who still long for the atmosphere of negative rigidity typical of the former administration, which was already exhausted at the time.

I therefore find it unrealistic and even unbelievable that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry should now want to condemn this Government on its record which however short is quite remarkable, what with its approach of consultation and its friendly relations with the provinces and other Canadians.

Once more, I cannot believe that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry was serious when he moved such a motion and I urge all right-thinking Members of this House to take a stand and to rise against this questionable and ambiguous legislation.

I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I am the sole author of these comments and that my hesitations were due to the fact that I had trouble deciphering my own handwriting since I wrote this speech during the lunch hour.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre).

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lanthier) on his speech.

I would like to comment that he was rather selective in the quotes he made. In fact, throughout his speech, he never quoted a full sentence. All he gave us was bits and pieces. One of the things he forgot to quote was the reaction of the Minister of Finance of Quebec. When he talks about this new attitude and not being rigid and all that, I wish the Parliamentary Secretary, who is from Quebec, would give us his position on the so-called legitimate claim by the Government of Quebec that what the Parliamentary Secretary refers to as an additional lump sum adjustment is in fact a payment to which it is morally entitled, and I would like to know what his reaction is to comments by the Quebec Minister of Finance, who claims, and rightly so, that the Federal Government owes him more money, and when he refers to the consultation process, I remember clearly that here in the House, his Minister said that he was still open to discussion, and a few days later, he decided that everything was settled, and so much for discussions. Consequently, I think that in addition to referring to Manitoba's position, the Parliamentary Secretary should have mentioned the position of Quebec, which after all should be of greater concern to him.

Supply

I also want to say that although the Parliamentary Secretary ought to know that regional economic development is not just a matter of equalization payments, he only touched on one aspect of the motion. There are all the other elements, and I am thinking of the industrial, agricultural, and transportation decentralization policies. I think the Parliamentary Secretary has given us a very restrictive view of the Opposition motion, and in trying to narrow its focus he did not do it justice. Perhaps Hon. Members failed to grasp the scope of the motion, but in any case, we on this side wanted to submit for consideration not just one isolated aspect but a comprehensive set of factors that are vital to the economic development of a region. I would therefore like to know what the Parliamentary Secretary has to say to that, and I also wish he would take a broader view and look beyond the narrow perspective provided by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Lanthier: Mr. Speaker, part of the question of the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) was directed at himself, so I hope he will answer that part. As to the question he asked me, it is threefold: first, he wants to know why I dealt with only one aspect; second what is my opinion as a Quebecer; third, he implied that I have a selective memory, as he put it. I hope that sums up his question.

First, we discussed only one aspect because I am speaking in my official capacity. I am very proud to represent the riding of LaSalle, Mr. Speaker, but I am now speaking on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). So I dealt with the part of the motion mentioned here and, of course, I had to be selective because other Members will speak to the motion. I was selective on one aspect, the part of the motion blaming the Government for undermining the will of Parliament by failing to act responsibly or to give due consideration to equalization policies inasmuch as they affect economic development. I wanted to deal with that particular aspect of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Second, as a Quebecer, I think that the words fair play are well chosen. As to the remark of the Quebec Minister of Finance, I would say he made more than one and I had an opportunity to study them thoroughly. I was able to debate this question with the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau)—to his satisfaction, I hope—and I think I answered it. I would urge the Hon. Member for Shefford to read *Hansard* where that complex issue was fully debated.

Third, the scope of my quotations was limited because I tried to select those which are relevant to the arguments raised by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) who, unfortunately, made the thrust of his debate bear on only one province. I had to answer his allegations. That is my answer to the Hon. Member for Shefford.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are over.