

cannot miss such an opportunity to prove that it is the Conservative Government which is guilty of making useless expenditures. It is common knowledge, for instance, that since last September there have been over 1,200 partisan appointments. Some were less partisan than others, perhaps one per cent—and I am being generous—but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that most appointments were extremely partisan and that a lot of money was spent in the process. I may also recall that the new Prime Minister increased the budget for his own office by 57 per cent. And this was done by those people who told us earlier that previous governments had spent money unnecessarily. Not them. Perish the thought! Remember Mr. Lawrence Hanigan, a defeated Progressive Conservative candidate, who was appointed to VIA Rail and received a salary increase of \$38,000 per year. Not bad for a defeated candidate, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that many Progressive Conservative backbenchers must be wondering whether maybe they should have lost in the last election.

This morning, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Blais) informed the House that the previous Government had been guilty of wasteful spending. I wonder whether the Parliamentary Secretary spoke to his colleague, the Minister of Communications (Mr. Masse), the "courant d'air national", about his trip to the Middle East which cost \$57,000. Mr. Speaker, as you see—

**Mr. Fontaine:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine), on a point of order.

**Mr. Fontaine:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not think the Hon. Member's remarks are relevant to the subject before the House today. He should stick to the subject being debated.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Considering his experience in the Ontario Legislature, I am sure the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) will be able to make his present comments relevant to the proposed legislation.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I was simply reacting to what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture said in his relevant speech about the fact that the previous Government had wasted taxpayers' money. And I think it is passing strange that the Hon. Member who just spoke should accuse the Parliamentary Secretary of not being relevant this morning. I am sure he will have something to say to him later on. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker.

In any case, perhaps we could change the subject, but I am sure we can look forward to the discussion these two Members will have later on, and I am sure the Hon. Member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blais) will not let it be said by his colleague that he is not relevant.

### *Agricultural Stabilization Act*

In any event, it is interesting to note that people who accuse others of wasteful spending can turn around and waste taxpayers' money on rewarding their Conservative friends.

[English]

Just before the lunch hour, Mr. Speaker, we were discussing the fact that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture in its policy manual, which is circulated to Hon. Members of Parliament every year, made many recommendations to us. Of course, it greatly advocates the implementation of a plan of stabilization, with which our Party agrees. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Parliamentary Secretary must clarify certain points to the House, particularly *vis-à-vis* the position of the various provinces. We know that some provinces are in favour of the Bill as it stands now, and our Party supports this type of legislation. We know that other provinces want clarification. Even as of late, Mr. Speaker, they are not convinced that the Bill should be in exactly the same form in which it is now, particularly, as I said previously, as it relates to the formula to be used to determine compensation. And, again, other provinces are against it.

I notice that the Parliamentary Secretary, in his opening remarks, referred to the fact that various commodity groups, in different proportions, had indicated their support for this Bill. He said that the provinces representing 54 per cent of pork producers were in favour of the Bill. This also means that the provinces representing almost half of the pork production are against it. With regard to pork production especially, because it affects my riding to a large extent, I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary could indicate to us what are some of the difficulties. Which provinces are still reluctant and why? I wonder if we can get some sort of clarification in that regard.

● (1420)

I have a final point to bring out, and I do so somewhat reluctantly. There is, of course, the continuing issue of beef coming from the European Economic Community, but over the last couple of weeks we have had the stalemate between the United States and Nicaragua regarding trade. We know that beef originating in Nicaragua was being sold in the U.S. I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary has any idea of what effect the U.S. embargo on trade with Nicaragua will have as it pertains to potential sales of beef to Canada originating in Nicaragua. If there are such sales and they will be increased, what effect does he think that will have on domestic prices of beef in Canada? I ask that with some reluctance, recognizing the gravity of the situation in that country, but nevertheless I would like to know the effect of such sales in Canada, if any. If he does not have any information right now, perhaps later on in correspondence he could indicate to members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and others interested in this issue whether any increases in sales of this commodity are expected.

I am looking forward to the Bill going to committee so that we can have a full and thorough discussion on the whole issue of price stabilization, Mr. Speaker. I must say in closing that I and all members of the committee are looking forward to what