

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether, after the meeting on June 12, he would give consideration to broadening the representation on the committee to include areas such as the Labrador fishery, which is presently omitted?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Labrador fishery is adequately represented but I will take into account as well any suggestions that my hon. friend has.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS**POSSIBILITY OF CONSTRUCTION POSTPONEMENT FOLLOWING BUDGETARY PROPOSALS**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Public Works whether, in view of the policy of the government, announced by the Minister of Finance the other evening, to try to discourage construction of office buildings in some 22 Canadian cities for the next two years, the Department of Public Works is considering postponement of any of its own building programs in those cities?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable cut-back in federal government building in recent years, as my hon. friend knows. We will pursue a policy of good business. At the present time we are paying a very large sum of money for rentals, amounting I think in Ottawa alone to \$18 million. We have the situation under review at the present time. If we can build buildings and bring about a situation where the rates quoted us are more competitive, then I suggest to my hon. friend we would be practising good economy, and this is what we intend to do.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am not being argumentative; I just want to understand the minister. Is he suggesting that there is one rule of good sense for the government and a different rule of good sense for business—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Stanfield: —and that the same reasons that might influence the government to go ahead with its plans would not prevail in the private sector?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member says he does not wish to be argumentative, but his supplementary question sounded that way.

[Mr. Davis.]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**MONTREAL—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF INTENTION RESPECTING NEW BUILDING**

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with construction of the C.B.C. building in Montreal? It is to cost \$66 million.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Broadview.

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member has asked his question but the minister does not answer.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): The minister, sir, wishes to reply. I might inform the hon. member that that building is not being built by the Department of Public Works. It is being built by the C.B.C.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: That's hairsplitting.

Mr. Hales: May I direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. Will he advise us if the C.B.C. is to proceed with its new building in Montreal?

[Translation]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): According to the last reports, Mr. Speaker, the C.B.C. has not indicated that it intends to suspend the work in progress.

[English]

NATIONAL CAPITAL**HULL, QUE.—POSSIBILITY OF REVIEW OF EXPANSION PLAN FOLLOWING BUDGETARY PROPOSALS**

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Since, as evidenced by the minister's recent statement about National Capital Commission plans, Ottawa and Hull are being considered together for purposes of planning and construction, will the minister say whether certain aspects of the government's new anti-inflationary policy will be reconsidered, since that policy now places Ottawa at a distinct disadvantage vis-à-vis Hull in this respect?