

remarks to the specific items in this Bill. I would respectfully request that the Member be required at least to be relevant to the topic.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The point made by the Hon. Member for Kitchener is, of course, well understood by the Chair. However, we are dealing with a matter that involves the salaries of Members of Parliament, and taking into consideration the speech made yesterday by a member of the Government, I must give the benefit of the doubt to the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) with regard to his comments.

**Mr. Boudria:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was indeed very well adjudicated by yourself, as usual. I am speaking on one of the Bills introduced pursuant to the Budget. I feel it is my responsibility to bring to your attention the fiscal policy and waste of taxpayers' dollars by the Government. That is what I am doing. I am also, as you indicated, Mr. Speaker, responding to the fact that the Parliamentary Secretary said yesterday that this Bill was one of the measures used by the Government to curb Government expenditures. I am trying to demonstrate why that is not so.

As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the Conservative Member opposite, let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, of an article in the *Ottawa Citizen* on July 16, 1984, in which the Leader of the Conservative Party said about his pro-patronage statements during the Progressive Conservative Party leadership race and his harsh criticism of the June 1984 Liberal appointments. He said: "I was talking to Tories then and that's what they wanted to hear. Talking to the Canadian public during an election campaign is something else". Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that someone who is now the Prime Minister could have made statements like that?

I have another quote from July, 1984. However, this one is so bad that if I were to read it, the Chair would probably rule it unparliamentary. The Leader of the Conservative Party also said to the Canadian Press on July 16 about patronage and about the method of making appointments: "The method of making appointments could be corrected by dramatic measures. We are going to bring in a brand new dimension of objectivity, representation and fairness to all Canadians".

As you probably very rightly understand by now, Mr. Speaker, these statements not only contradict the present policy of the Government but they contradict each other. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was saying something different when talking to Tory partisans from what he said when talking to the Canadian people.

In 1977 I considered running for provincial office in the Province of Ontario. I later decided to wait until the next election. A close friend said to me at that time that if I run for office I should remember one thing because only one thing is important: "Ask yourself continuously the question; what happens in case I get elected?" That may sound funny to Hon. Members opposite but he went on to say: "If you are defeated, there is no problem. You just go back and do what you were

doing before. But if you are elected, you have to deliver those things you told the people you would do for them". I think the present Prime Minister should have asked himself that question before making his 338 promises. He should have asked himself: "What happens in case I get elected?" If he had done so, he would not have made those contradictory promises. He would not have made those statements to the people of Canada which have caused the Government and the Prime Minister to lose so quickly the confidence of the Canadian people. Obviously, it was not carefully thought out.

[Translation]

But Canadians will not be fooled again. They know better Mr. Speaker. Canadians have been misled once by the Conservatives, and I can tell you that it will never happen again as long as the Government operates this way. Canadians want a more open Government, and you will see that after the next election we will again have a Liberal Government.

[English]

**Mr. Reimer:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I might seek the unanimous consent of the House to ask the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) a question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**An Hon. Member:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent. Resuming debate.

• (1200)

**Mr. McDermid:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) said that he would be happy to consider questions at an appropriate time. He has finished his speech, and I think this is an appropriate time for him to accept such questions. The only person who said "no" was the Hon. Member for—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I asked Hon. Members for unanimous consent and I heard someone say: "No". Thus, there was not unanimous consent. The Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) on debate.

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, it is really unfortunate and a disservice to this House that the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) made such a speech lambasting the Government, quite correctly, and then when the opportunity came about for Hon. Members to put questions to him it was a Liberal colleague of his who denied us the opportunity to explore this matter further with him.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Mr. Speaker, those to my right are called Grits. I think they should be called "hypo-Grits". We saw a