

Let us have a look at capital spending. When Tories hear the facts they cannot face them and they leave the House, like the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) is now doing. Let us have a look at per capita spending. The hon. member for Calgary Centre talked a lot about government spending, but which province in 1976 had the lowest per capita spending in the country? Was it the province of Ontario or the province of Alberta, or was it a Tory province at all? The answer is no; it was the province of Saskatchewan. It spent \$1,436 per capita. Alberta had a per capita expenditure of \$1,657, with Ontario spending over \$1,700. All the other provinces had per capita expenditures that were higher, including Tory Ontario.

Let us look at government debt. Everybody knows that Saskatchewan for years was a very poor or have-not province. It was a province that always received transfer payments from the federal government. Let us look at government debt because we often get lectures in this House by Tories about how they would get rid of debts if they were in power. The lowest per capita provincial debt in this country is not the debt of a Tory province, and not that of the province of Alberta, but rather the province of Saskatchewan with a debt of \$980 per capita. The province of Quebec is second with a per capita debt of \$1,803. Alberta, with all its wealth and immense potential, its heritage fund and everything else, has a per capita debt of \$1,880; in other words, twice as high as the per capita debt of the province of Saskatchewan. Then there is wealthy Ontario with a per capita debt of \$2,059. In poorer provinces such as Newfoundland, the per capita debt is \$3,000.

• (1600)

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Oh, oh!

Mr. Nystrom: Tory New Brunswick is very, very bad. In Saskatchewan, however, one-seventh of every cent goes toward paying off the debt of the province, whereas in Ontario eight cents of every tax dollar goes into paying off the provincial debt. We must put into perspective the fact that the Tories are very, very poor when it comes to managing the taxpayers' money. I am not quoting the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) or the hon. member for Edmonton Centre or anybody else in that party; I am merely quoting the facts as they are stated by statistics Canada with regard to the various provincial governments in this country.

The third area which I would like to talk about in the three minutes I have left is corporate waste. We talk a lot about government waste, but there is also corporate waste which in many cases, I think, is more extravagant or, at least, as extravagant as the waste by the government of this country.

I remember CEMA and the great debate about the egg marketing agency a few years ago. People hit the roof because a few million eggs had spoiled. The spoiled eggs represented about one half of one per cent of the eggs produced in this country. It amounted to about one day's production by all the hens in Canada. If a company had a margin of error of less than one half of one per cent, I am sure that many people would say that they had a very efficient board of directors.

Waste and Mismanagement

There are many cases of corporate waste. For example, I have a report commissioned by the Food Prices Review Board called the Mallen report. The report discusses the waste in the retail food system of our country and how Canadians are paying more than they should because of the fact companies are so wasteful. The report also discusses excess capacity. They said, for example, that the average excess capacity increased the price of food by some 3.7 per cent. In Sydney, for example, people are paying—

Mr. McKenzie: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nystrom: One of the Tories is terribly upset. I wonder if anybody has a valium tablet.

Mr. McKenzie: I will cover it when I am on my feet.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman but his allotted time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: More, more!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Nevertheless, he may continue if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I will take but one minute, and I thank the House for giving me the additional time. I was talking about—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I hear someone telling me that there is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I hope that you, sir, will take note of the fact that to the speaker of the Conservative party who moved this motion, we gave unanimous consent. I want the House to notice how ungracious certain members in the official opposition appear to be.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. That is a matter which is beyond our control.

[Translation]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, in support of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), I must say there was unanimous consent, I think, to allow the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) to continue his speech for a few minutes. I respect your decision, but I would like to add a few remarks on the motion presented by the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre). It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that once in a while—in fact, often—we have to introduce motions such as this one to make the public aware of the carelessness and incompetence of the government which has been in power for almost ten years.

On November 29, 1977, in a motion I introduced in this House, I mentioned particularly the lack of foresight and