

the Senate and pay people additional money for carrying on these services? We have been told this is a Government of restraint, but surely that is not so, given the way it is throwing money around. It is not a big amount of money. We are not going to go broke because of the expenditure of that amount of money. We are broke already and we have to demonstrate to Canadians that we in the Houses of Parliament are serious about the problems that we are facing with the size of the Government deficit. This is just one more signal that is being conveyed to Canadians to demonstrate that this is not a Government of restraint and it is not a Government which takes seriously in any way at all the very important financial problems that we in the country are facing.

● (1620)

I call upon Hon. Members opposite, and particularly the backbenchers, to support us. We now have the opportunity to vote on an element of the Bill that is not very significant to Government reorganization as such but is only a sideline to that reorganization. A vote against that will not cause the reorganization to stop in its tracks. We know that the Government must force this Government Organization Act through. It has been in operation for 18 months now, and we cannot turn back the clock. Decisions have already been made, and we expect that. However, this is one point on which backbenchers can demonstrate their independence from the Government. They can demonstrate to the Government their dissatisfaction with the example set of increasing the size of the trough for the Party in power, and they can also demonstrate to the people of Canada that at least the backbench, if not the Government, takes very seriously the question of Government restraint.

**Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important amendment and a very important issue which is now before the House and it is one which disturbs me a great deal. The way I approach an amendment of this nature, Mr. Speaker, is to first ask why the changes have been proposed. We Progressive Conservatives very much believe in change but we believe philosophically that there must be a demonstrated reason for that change. We do not believe in change simply for the sake of change.

When I ask myself why this particular proposal has been made, I find it very difficult to find a convincing answer. It has been suggested, of course, that there should be more Parliamentary Secretaries and that those Parliamentary Secretaries should in some cases be selected from the Senate. Looking at the question in those terms, any reason I can find for the Government having proposed this legislation is rather unconvincing. Why do we need more Parliamentary Secretaries? There has been no real evidence presented as to the need for more Parliamentary Secretaries in terms of workload.

One cannot help but think that this proposal represents some sort of boondoggle on the part of the Government. More Parliamentary Secretaries would mean more opportunities to reward faithful Party supporters either within this House or within the other. It therefore seems to me that more Parlia-

mentary Secretaries would enable the Government and the Cabinet to keep the backbench in line.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if one were to be Machiavellian, one could see that it would be useful for the Government to distribute more patronage at a time when the Gallup poll shows that there are reasons for concern on the other side of the House and at a time when we are led to believe that there is dissatisfaction within the ranks and therefore a need for more goodies to be distributed. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that reason is an inadequate one for proposing a change. The possibility that such a reason may exist is one reason why we on this side of the House would oppose this particular measure.

I am particularly concerned, Mr. Speaker, by the suggestion that Senators should be eligible for appointment as Parliamentary Secretaries because I can see no reason for that proposal. Surely none of us would contend that the Senators themselves need the additional stipend of some \$10,000. Surely we do not believe that there is such a lack of talent on the other side of the House that they must go to the Senate to find people to fill these positions should the positions be created. Surely we do not believe that this proposal in itself will somehow make the Senate a more viable institution than it is now.

At the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, we expressed the opinion that perhaps if the Senate were reformed, there would be some legitimate reason for making this proposal. If it is reformed, then it might well be appropriate for this measure to be introduced in the House. Prior to that reform taking place, I can see no logical explanation whatsoever for this proposal to be made at this time.

It has been suggested that we are only speaking about four Parliamentary Secretaries and therefore, it has been suggested, we are only speaking about the expenditure of some \$40,000. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very important point which must be addressed. In the minds of many Canadians, \$40,000 is a great deal of money. It may not be very much money when it is compared to the size of the deficit that the Government has incurred to this point in time. However, to the unemployed Canadian, \$40,000 is a great deal of money.

We read in the papers that the various Ministers on that side of the House are searching through their budgets in an attempt to find money to deal with unemployment. There has been some suggestion that if they can find this money, they will direct it toward youth unemployment. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government is serious about its concern for the unemployed youth, it now has the opportunity to withdraw this particular measure and support the amendment which is before the House, which will prohibit this expenditure of \$40,000. That in itself would be a step in the right direction.

This morning I spoke to a young lady who was in great distress. She told me that she had \$86.19 left to her name. She was searching for employment and she was searching for a place to live. For someone in that particular position—and unfortunately there are too many who are in that position today—the unnecessary expenditure of \$40,000 is a shame,