

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

### AGRICULTURE

#### MARKETS FOR SURPLUS EGG PRODUCTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin):** Madam Speaker, given that yesterday the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency announced that it will pay egg producers to slaughter some of their hens in order to reduce the large surplus of eggs on the Canadian market, and recognizing the urgency and importance of this situation to all Canadian egg producers and consumers, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Scott):

That the Minister of Agriculture act decisively and allow Canagrex to prove its worth in this situation and find markets for surplus protein from time to time and that the minister get on with this legislation, or is this another one of his "in a few more weeks" kind of proposition?

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

### PUBLIC SERVICE

#### EMPLOYMENT OF NATIVE PEOPLES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, since the 1980-1981 report on increased participation of indigenous people in the Public Service has pointed out the failure of the government to hire and promote Canada's native people, and whereas only 19 of 58 government departments and agencies last June complied with a Treasury Board directive to prepare action plans for native employment, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant):

● (1415)

That this House expresses its regret that the only Treasury Board action that has resulted from the release of this damning document was a news release by the President of Treasury Board which reiterated policies that ministers and government departments have ignored in the past.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

### Oral Questions

[Translation]

### AIRPORTS

#### MIRABEL—REDRESS FOR EXPROPRIATED LAND OWNERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona):** Madam Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion concerning a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Considering that nearly 500 buildings, both agricultural and commercial, have been destroyed for no apparent reason outside the operational sector of Mirabel airport; considering that a number of people were forced to leave their homes as a result of unsound administration, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Gurbin):

That the government right the wrong it has done to those people and to all the others who still live there by taking immediate steps to resell those lands.

**Madam Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### HOUSING

#### MINISTER'S POSITION ON RENT CONTROLS

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for housing. On March 3 the Prime Minister made it clear to this House that rent controls are a matter of provincial jurisdiction. He also made it clear that the minister of housing's comments during the Ontario election, no matter which side of the issue the minister was on that particular day, were not an enunciation of federal government policy in provincial matters. The minister has raised the issue of rent controls again. In view of the Prime Minister's comments, is it still the intention of the minister to seek the federal cabinet's instructions, vis-à-vis a policy of rent controls, as he indicated to the House yesterday?

**Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of Public Works):** Madam Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, although the hon. gentleman was not here, the National Housing Conference indicated that some provinces think that the issue of rent control is a good policy device. Some think it is not. Some provinces have changed their minds and are in the process of changing from rental control to a gradual withdrawal of control. This is a matter of provincial jurisdiction. However, as a citizen of this country and one who observes the effects of this provincial policy, of course I have my personal opinion. No doubt the