

*Oral Questions***POLYSAR**POSSIBILITY OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST MANAGEMENT
IN VIEW OF COMMITTEE REPORT

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance as minister responsible for majority shareholdings in the Canadian Development Corporation which in turn is the owner of Polysar. In light of the report of the Public Accounts Committee tabled yesterday, can the minister inform the House whether, in view of the committee's request, disciplinary action has been taken against the management?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to bring the report of the Public Accounts Committee to the attention of the management of the Canadian Development Corporation, the parent company of Polysar, with the indication that I expect them to take the disciplinary action that the facts warrant.

Mrs. Pigott: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. For the information of the minister I understand Mr. John Silver of the public relations department of Polysar says such action has been taken but he would not disclose the details. Would the minister undertake to report to the House on this as soon as possible?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to report to the House or a committee.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCEPURCHASE OF LAND FOR DEFENCE RESEARCH CENTRE AT
WINNIPEG—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister inform the House if there are any new developments on the purchase by the Department of National Defence of parcels of land in the city of Winnipeg for the location of a defence research centre and has any deadline been established for the commencement of construction?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an updated report at this time. Negotiations for land are still taking place. I thought they had been completed but I understand they have not. I have asked for an update on the situation by next Monday.

DEFENCE RESEARCH CENTRE AT WINNIPEG—POSSIBILITY OF
TRADE-OFF BY LOSING AIR COMMAND

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): A supplementary question. May I ask the minister if he is under any pressure or is he giving consideration to moving air command headquarters from Winnipeg to Ottawa? Is there to be a trade-off, that is, to get the defence research centre we lose air command headquarters or are we to lose both establishments?

[Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale).]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there is no question of trade-off or losing air command. Air command is well established in Winnipeg and is doing a first-rate job there with excellent people who are happy in that great city.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

TV AND RADIO BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE
HOUSE AND ITS COMMITTEES

Fourth report of Special Committee on TV and Radio Broadcasting of Proceedings of the House and its Committees—Mr. Speaker.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order as a result of incidents that occurred during question period today and on previous occasions. At the outset, I want to say to Your Honour that I do not, of course, challenge your rulings and interpretations placed upon what transpired in this House, but I think it is important to seek clarification.

On Wednesday, as reported at page 7367 of *Hansard*, I responded to a statement made by the Solicitor General and made what I considered to be an accurate and appropriate point, that I believed the rejection of my request concerning the tabling and printing of material in *Hansard* had been refused because of consent not being forthcoming from the government benches. Your Honour indicated—I take it, to correct a statement I had made in the course of my presentation—that in your hearing there were cries of “No” from both sides of the House. That is the essence of it, although it is reported as one intervention.

Today I was involved in questioning the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on what I think is a most important duty of a member of parliament, the scrutiny of public expenditures. I will review the questions as they are reported in *Hansard*, because I do not want to do a disservice to anyone in this House. The purpose of my questions was quite clear in my own mind. I wanted to determine whether, in the case of this minister, we had a situation of culpability by virtue of gullibility, or whether there was some perspective on the part of the minister with respect to the responsibility of government, represented by the minister responsible for AECL, to involve himself in the activities of AECL.

The point I am making is that the questions I raised today were directed to finding out the extent of the minister's involvement. In the first question I asked, generally, whether he was personally involved in co-operating with the RCMP to determine whether there were fresh instances of wrongful payments by AECL. He answered that he would co-operate and he was involving himself. I recall that. The second part of