

[Text]

PULLORUM/TYPHOID ERADICATION PROGRAM

Question No. 297—**Mr. Althouse:**

1. For 1984-85, what was the cost to the taxpayer of the Pullorum Testing Program conducted through the Department of Agriculture?
2. What is the expected cost for 1985-86?
3. In 1984-85 how many birds were declared to be carrying pullorum and how many were tested?
4. Is the program one that will be paid for by users and, if so (a) what will be the fee (b) will the fee remain compulsory for all exhibitors at fairs, exhibitions and poultry shows?
5. How long will the program continue?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The cost for the Pullorum/Typhoid Eradication Program conducted through Agriculture Canada was \$81,259. Compensation paid under the program was \$3,457.

2. For 1985-86, the cost is expected to be \$41,847 and \$2,500 for compensation.

3. During 1984, 62,146 game and exhibition birds were tested, 297 reacted serologically, two of which were culture positive.

4. No charge was made for testing in 1984. No charge is being considered in the future since testing of exhibition birds will be phased out.

5. Certain parts of the program will continue indefinitely to meet import certification demands of countries.

[Translation]

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The question enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

[English]

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Parliamentary Secretary when we might expect a reply to Question No. 86 which was asked on November 15, 1984, dealing with the removal of PCBs from old DEW line sites in the Northwest Territory?

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to inform the Hon. Member that so far we have answered 65.7 per cent of all questions put and we will be answering that one soon.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining question stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—
GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the granting of an untendered contract to the brother-in-law of the present Minister of Finance by the Government of Canada is an unacceptable action.

He said: **Mr. Speaker,** I rise to speak to this motion mainly because it was impossible for us during the course of a number of Question Periods and the questioning that went on therein to elicit from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) an indication as to whether he believed the action taken by the now Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Andre) with regard to the granting of a contract to the brother-in-law of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) is an action that is acceptable in the eyes of the Prime Minister and, therefore, acceptable in the mind of the Government.

We tried on numerous occasions to have the Prime Minister answer a relatively simple question. The question was this, and I want to put it on the record so that anyone watching, listening, or perhaps at some future date reading the events of the last week will be able to understand what is in fact the question to which we have been trying to get an answer.

On April 24 I rose in my place during the Question Period and said the following; as reported at page 4057 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister believe that it is appropriate for the relative of a Cabinet Minister to receive benefits from an untendered contract?

On that day the Prime Minister refused even to get to his feet to respond to the question. In fact, the question was answered by the Minister of Supply and Services. Let me put on the record now what his answer was:

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to explain to members of the New Democratic Party on at least five or six occasions the nature of the advertising agency business in this country. I repeat that we selected Lawson Murray because it is known to us. It has our trust because it is an expert in this field. The firm demonstrated the wisdom of our decision by coming up with savings of at least a half million dollars a year, and I repeat, I will always sign those kinds of contracts.

● (1210)

I put that on the record because I think any clear thinking individual would appreciate that that answer, interesting though it is, was not an answer to the question I asked. It bore no relationship to the question I asked. It did not address the question of the appropriateness of the granting of an untendered—and I emphasize and underline untendered—contract to a relative of a Minister of the Crown.

That question is fundamental to the system in which we operate. I therefore rose again and said on that same day, as reported at page 4057 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister. Is it the opinion of the Prime Minister that it is appropriate for the relative of a Cabinet Minister to receive benefit from an untendered contract with the Government?