

will facilitate early retirement and should minimize the loss of jobs.

The Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood also knows that the Minister of Communications requested the CBC to attempt to make the reductions primarily in administrative areas. In this regard, the Minister requested that the Corporation attempt to manage the cuts so as to minimize the negative impact on Canadian producers, creators and artists whose development the Government intends to encourage. The objective is to ensure that the public resources now devoted to support of artistic and journalistic expression are employed in the most effective manner possible and that the budgetary restrictions do not jeopardize the federal Government's investment in the cultural development of the nation.

Regarding consultations, the Minister specified that they take place with due regard for the respective responsibilities of the Minister of Communications and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and possible infringement on their respective mandates. The Hon. Member may be interested to know that only this morning all four Windsor area Members of Parliament representing each of the three political parties—two from the New Democratic Party—met with my Minister and me on the unique effect of the cut-backs in Windsor. That consultation is indeed going on.

● (1820)

We hope the CBC will be as effective in its use of public funds as it is creative in its programming.

In closing, I hope the Hon. Member shares my confidence that the fiscal restraint program as it affects the CBC and its employees will be managed by the Corporation with due consideration for personnel and will encourage the utmost use of the employees' creative talents and skills.

THE ADMINISTRATION—GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS—
REMUNERATION LEVELS. (B) EXTERNAL AID—GOVERNMENT
POSITION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, in this House on March 26, 1985, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) how he could rationalize a salary increase to two Conservative appointees while at the same time everyone else in this country was asked to tighten his or her belt.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, that day I asked the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) why the salary of Mr. Roy McMurtry, our High Commissioner in London, had been increased and he was now receiving \$105,000 per year, when his predecessor was getting only \$75,000. I also asked how he could explain that Mr. Lawrence Hanigan, the defeated Conservative candidate in the riding of Laval-des-Rapides, who has now been appointed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), or should I say rewarded for having played the sacrificial lamb in the election, running against my hon. friend from Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), I therefore asked what

Adjournment Debate

justification there was for paying Mr. Hannigan a salary of \$135,000 for being the head of VIA Rail.

Mr. Speaker, I asked these questions in the light of the budgetary cutbacks that were made in this country.

[English]

I want to remind you and the House, Mr. Speaker, that on November 8, 1984, many programs were cut that affect people in my constituency. Two in particular come to mind at this time and I would like to draw them to your attention, Sir.

There was a \$6.2 million cut-back in dairy programs involving the subsidy going to dairy farmers in my riding and elsewhere. The farmers in my constituency could not, and still cannot afford this kind of cut-back. There were also increases of \$32.3 million in what the Government has called cost recoveries in agriculture. These cost recoveries are nothing less than a tax on such things as agricultural inspection of farm products. The farmers in my riding cannot afford that. The people in my riding now have to do with less than what they had before this Government came to power.

Do defeated Tory candidates have to do with less? No, Mr. Speaker. It is almost enough, as I said previously today, for the elected backbenchers of the Conservative Party to make them wish they had been defeated so they too could earn \$135,000, like their colleagues, Mr. Lawrence Hannigan and Mr. Roy McMurtry.

This is particularly hypocritical in view of the comments made by the Leader of the Conservative Party during the election campaign. Let me read you a few of the commitments he made to show just how much certain commitments detract from each other.

In *The Globe and Mail* for May 24, 1983, the Leader of the Conservative Party probably best expressed his views on political patronage when he was reported to have said, "There will be jobs for Liberals and NDPs too after I have been Prime Minister for 15 years and I can't find a living, breathing Tory in the country". On July 16, 1984, the new converted Leader of the Conservative Party called the Liberal appointments "a fraud, a deceit, and a sham". Also on July 16 he was quoted as having told the press that the Conservative Party would only make appointments of the highest quality of people. Where is this high quality?

● (1825)

The Government hired an individual to run VIA Rail at \$135,000 per year who had been in charge of the Montreal Urban Transit Commission which had 20 strikes in 10 years, one of the worst records in labour-management relations. By coincidence, this person was a defeated Conservative candidate. He was given a large salary, larger than what most people in my riding make in a year, in order to run VIA Rail. Not only that, but the Secretary of State for External Affairs told us that Mr. Hannigan received a salary increase because he had increased responsibility. If his predecessor was in charge of running VIA Rail and this gentleman is now in