

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 9, 1978

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1107)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

CALL FOR AMENDMENT TO END DISCRIMINATION AGAINST
SINGLE PERSONS 60 TO 65—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I raise a matter that is of continuing urgency. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House urges the government to introduce before this session ends an amendment to the Old Age Security Act to end the discrimination therein against persons of single status between the ages of 60 and 65 by providing for the equivalent of the spouse's allowance to be available to all persons between the ages of 60 and 65 regardless of marital status, provided they are out of the labour market.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion for debate at this time, pursuant to Standing Order 43, requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

PUBLIC WORKS

LES TERRASSES DE LA CHAUDIÈRE PROJECT, HULL, QUEBEC—
ANSWER OF MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question concerns Les Terrasses de la Chaudière project in Hull. As the Minister of Public Works has been absent from his place during the question period for the last three days, I was going to direct my question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, but in his absence I will direct it to the Prime Minister.

Is the Prime Minister aware that the Minister of Public Works, in reply to my colleague, the hon. member for Gren-

ville-Carleton, as reported at page 6045 of *Hansard* for June 5, misled the House when he said:

Let us make it clear, however, that there were reasons why this arrangement was entered into. The land in question was partially owned by Mr. Campeau's corporation. The question really is, are you going to expropriate the land of a developer and then offer it to other developers? There was some question of ethics involved in the matter as well, since he owned part of the land which is in play and which is, in fact, being used for this development.

In light of the fact that the land was not owned by Mr. Campeau or the Campeau corporation—it was only under option and was not purchased until February 13, 1975—could the Prime Minister give some kind of explanation, that would be credible, for the statement of the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. Frank Maine (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to correct the false impression which the hon. member left in his question, that the Minister of Public Works was absent. In fact, he was here yesterday, when the Leader of the Opposition was not. The statement which the minister made last week is essentially correct, in that the land was privately owned and, therefore, had a different aspect so far as the negotiations were concerned.

Mr. Huntington: The facts do not bear out that answer, Mr. Speaker. Still pertaining to the land assembly problem surrounding the Les Terrasses project, perhaps the parliamentary secretary could explain the \$600,000 overpayment to Hydro Quebec, particularly in light of the fact that the National Capital Commission went to the expense of having three independent appraisals made proving its worth below \$1,700,000.

Mr. Maine: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the statement made by the hon. gentleman, but I will certainly consult with the departmental officials and get back to him at a later date.

● (1112)

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the acting minister, whoever that may be. If the facts surrounding Les Terrasses de la Chaudière project are as tidy as the Minister of Public Works would have us believe, can the minister give us a believable explanation for the total rejection of the Campeau project by loyal, hardworking public servants involved in both the Department of Public Works and the National Capital Commission who were overruled by ministers acting politically?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.