myself to the possible rather than to the more difficult mission he has assigned to me.

The question of marketing boards was not, I have to say, prominently discussed at the meeting. There is the recognition that there is a difficult interface to be established here and the demand, as suggested by the hon. gentleman, was not made by me. Yes, this is a question on which, very obviously, we shall need to consult closely.

Mr. McGrath: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Finance, in view of the questionable constitutional jurisdiction in this area, if the government intends to direct the Minister of Agriculture immediately to enter into negotiations and discussions with his provincial counterparts, to ensure that provincial marketing boards as well as federal marketing boards adhere to the federal guidelines, so that some of these consumer rip-offs can be ended forthwith?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the hon. member's suggestion, that there is any doubt about constitutionality in this particular area. As I say, that doubt was not evinced by any of the ten provincial governments represented at the meeting. With regard to discussions with the provinces, that, as I said, is obviously a matter which will need to be discussed and I think the Minister of Agriculture would be a first-class spokesman in this regard.

* * *

HOUSING

MINISTER'S INTENTION WITH REGARD TO MEETING PROVINCIAL MINISTERS PRIOR TO INTRODUCTION OF NEW PROGRAM

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. As we have now seen two meetings convened by the present government, one with the premiers and the other with provincial finance ministers, for the purpose of seeking their co-operation for the anti-inflationary program after the program had been decided on—the government did not seek their input prior to its announcement—and as this approach has contributed to public uncertainty regarding the program, will the minister say if he intends to meet with provincial ministers of housing, to discuss his proposed housing measures before they are introduced, in order to avoid further confusions and aggravation in an area of shared jurisdiction.

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with all provincial housing ministers, asking if they wanted a meeting in relation to the guidelines. There was no consensus for the holding of such a meeting. Actually, only two ministers wanted it, because they had not attended the last housing ministers meeting. I am prepared to meet with them. I assure the hon. member that the input from the last two or three meetings I had with provincial housing ministers is having a significant impact on new legislation and new proposals which will be presented shortly. I will be pleased to meet with them. Actually, I will be canvassing them again, to see when they wish to have another meeting.

PUBLIC SERVICE

PAY INCREASES FOR EXECUTIVE CATEGORY—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF ALLEGEDLY CONFLICTING STATEMENTS BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the Prime Minister's statement made in the House yesterday, as reported on page 8473 of *Hansard*, to the effect that cabinet decided on July 24 to accept the new salary ranges for senior civil servants, and in view of the previous statement made in the House on July 28, in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, to the effect that the decision had not yet been reached on July 28, can the Acting Prime Minister, in view of the two different dates which were mentioned, and the contradictions, clarify these obvious contradictions for the House?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Prime Minister consulted the records and found that on July 24 the cabinet had decided in principle to adopt certain increases in the salary ranges for senior civil servants. We did not adopt fully the recommendations of the Lambert Commission. We made some independent judgment rather reducing what they had recommended. But I understand from the Prime Minister that he did look up the record, and the decision was made on July 24.

PAY INCREASES FOR EXECUTIVE CATEGORY—DATE OF SIGNING OF TREASURY BOARD MINUTES

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am happy that the Acting Prime Minister has clarified the matter, since *Hansard* for July 28 suggests the opposite. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister the following question. In view of the Prime Minister's statement yesterday to the effect that the government was still slotting senior civil servants into the new salary ranges up until two weeks ago, does that mean that the Treasury Board minutes, or some of them, were not signed until at least two weeks ago? If so, can he tell us the relevant dates on which the Treasury Board minutes were signed?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot answer that question. The Prime Minister yesterday outlined the facts, that to the extent these matters are published, they will appear. There always has been a reservation to the effect that the individual salaries of senior civil servants should not be published, but simply the ranges themselves within which their salaries are determined. I do not think there is any contradiction. I think the hon. gentleman is trying to create dispute about nothing at all.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a final supplementary question to the Acting Prime Minister? Does the Prime Minister's statement made in the House yesterday, to the effect that the final slotting for senior civil servants was not completed until two weeks ago, not mean that the