

**The Speaker:** I have a point of order from the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

\* \* \*

## POINTS OF ORDER

### COMMENTS DURING DEBATE

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On March 1 in the House I mistakenly stated that the member for London—Middlesex had made unacceptable comments about the children of the member for Medicine Hat.

It was the member for Victoria—Haliburton who made these remarks and not the member for London—Middlesex. I wish to apologize to the member for London—Middlesex.

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my hon. colleague for his apology. I was surprised how I could have been in the House at that time insulting anyone since it was my privilege to be having lunch with some other colleagues—with the Prime Minister—that day.

I appreciate his clarifying the record.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## WAYS AND MEANS

### TABLING OF NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 83(1), I have the honour to lay upon the Table a Notice of Ways and Means motion concerning certain measures announced in the February 1995 budget. I ask that you designate an Order of the Day for the consideration of the said motion.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## THE BUDGET

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government and the amendment.

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, certainly the impact of my words have lost some of their oomph, as the hon. colleague says, given the delay.

## The Budget

I did want to say to the member opposite who is no longer in the Chamber that paranoia will destroy you, and I am not paranoid.

**Mr. Hermanson:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I believe it is not proper procedure to note members that are not in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sure the hon. member will apologize for having done that.

**Ms. Torsney:** Madam Speaker, I do apologize for that.

• (1505)

As I was saying earlier it is important that we set clear targets. As anybody or any business that has been in a debt situation knows you have to set clear targets and meet those targets. That is certainly what the government is doing.

You do not cut off your nose to spite your face. We still have to make investments in the future. We still have to get out from underneath the debt and deficit situation. We will do so by making strategic investments, by setting clear targets and by continuing to meet those targets as we have in the last year and actually exceeding them. That is the conclusion of my remarks.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The hon. member's time has expired.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in this debate in order to point out a number of contradictions in the budget, in the way cuts are made, cuts I would describe as bad.

The first thing I would like to draw to the attention of this House is the cuts in research and development, particularly in the agricultural sector. In this period of worldwide change, this time of market globalization, it is very surprising for a government to be cutting out all research in such a draconian and definitive fashion in the area of ovine production—production for the development of sheep farming. This type of production is both ecological and a source of diversification for a number of regions in Canada.

The decision was made in the budget to close the experimental farm at La Pocatière. This is a federal experimental farm, the oldest one in Quebec, which, only two years ago, was given the exclusive mandate for research in sheep farming for all of eastern Canada and in fact for Canada as a whole. A few years ago, a new sheep barn was built there at a cost of \$10 million—money simply forgotten today. We are told that this farm will be closed, despite the fact that the sheep industry should get the most out of investment in research and development.

This situation is in blatant contradiction with the Liberal Party program and the guidelines of the present government on support to the agriculture industry. It is a contradiction, and I believe the government should reverse its decision and continue to pay the cost of research and development in sheep production