

question No. 3,698 that I placed on the order paper has some extreme importance attached to it.

It has no political value to me or anyone else, but it is of significant value to the business community of Canada to have the answer to that question.

I think it is a simple question and there should be a ready answer. I wonder if I might stress to the parliamentary secretary the absolute urgency of obtaining the answer to that question now, before the consequences which may well flow from the actions by the government and its representatives begin.

I am extremely concerned that we find out, if we can, what the legal authority is for the actions taken by the government with regard to the imposition of the recently-announced but not yet approved changes to the Income Tax Act and other acts.

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I have taken due note of that representation and I will discuss it with the appropriate minister.

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary exactly what is happening with my question, No. 2,214. Is there any progress on it?

Mr. Smith: I believe so, Madam Speaker, but I will make inquiries.

Mr. Young: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary when we can expect answers to my questions Nos. 3,380 through to 3,438 to be tabled. I recently noticed that some ministers have been circulating answers to those questions to members of the House and have not been answering those questions on the Order Paper, in spite of assurances by the parliamentary secretary that he would try to expedite answers to those significant questions in response to the obstacles report. Could the parliamentary secretary tell me when we can expect to have those answers properly tabled in the House rather than simply having them circulated to members of the House?

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I will be pursuing that matter on behalf of the hon. member.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Madam Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 71 in the name of the hon. member for Skeena?

Madam Speaker: The member is not in the House at the present time. I did call him.

Canagrex Act

Mr. Smith: I would ask all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall notices of motions for the production of papers stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANAGREX ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed, from Friday, January 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Whelan that Bill C-85, an act to establish a corporation called Canagrex to promote, facilitate and engage in the export of agricultural and food products from Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to continue my representations on Bill C-85. My previous comments on this bill lead me back to the issue of corporations versus department, and whether this dream of the minister should be realized through a new Crown corporation of the government or whether it should be a wing of the Department of Agriculture.

It also leads me to the question of the utilization of embassies and their staffs and whether the goals can even be achieved with the present number of staff members allotted to the corporation and with the funding that has been promised to that corporation.

I have great respect for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). I honestly believe that he is hard-working, sincere and concerned about agriculture in Canada. However, I am worried about how effective he is with that bunch over on that side of the House. The minister has undoubtedly been trying for a considerable length of time to get cabinet approval of this bill. Earlier in his announcement about Canagrex he stated that he would need a budget of \$62.3 million and a staff of approximately 150 people. It is obvious that he had problems with the cabinet and difficulty in convincing them to meet these standards which he established because cabinet did not approve the \$62.3 million or the staff of approximately 150. Instead, they approved an amount of \$12.3 million and a staff of 12. That starts Canagrex out of the blocks with \$50 million less than the minister thought was necessary and some 138 people short of the number he thought should be able to do the job. This puts a tremendous problem in front of Canagrex in terms of effectiveness.

Another concern which deeply disturbs me is why we are not using the embassies and the consulates around the world to enhance sales of our agricultural products. I thought that the