

Order for Return

[English]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN**VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—METRO PARKING LTD.****Question No. 1,351—Mr. Benjamin:**

1. What was the proposed management fee for Metro Parking Ltd. for each of the five years from the commencement of their contract for operation of the parking concession at the Vancouver International Airport in September 1968?

2. (a) What was the amount stated in the contract for salaries and wages in each of those years (b) what has been the annual cost of salaries and wages to date (c) has the government paid any amounts for salaries and wages additional to the amounts stated in the contract and, if so, what are the amounts?

3. What are the hourly rates of pay in this operation?

4. What was the total amount of Metro's deposit to the credit of the Receiver-General in each of the months since commencement of their operation?

5. In what amounts have semi-monthly payments been made to Metro commencing in September 1968?

6. Have any payments additional to the contract amounts been made to Metro parking since September 1968 and, if so (a) in what amounts (b) for what reason?

7. Was any allowance made in the contract for loss of revenue caused by break-down of equipment and, if so, what are the amounts allowed to date?

8. What is the monthly average number of cars parked at this concession?

9. Is any audit made of revenues received and, if so (a) by whom (b) is an audit report available?

Return tabled.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with regard to starred question No. 40 which stands in my name. It has been on the order paper since October 8, more than eight months ago. It reads as follows:

What are the results of the inquiry undertaken by the Minister of National Health and Welfare into the news leak of the report of the LeDain Commission on the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?

On at least three occasions I have asked what progress is being made with respect to answering this question. I have received the answer, in almost apologetic terms, that the matter would be looked into and an answer would be forthcoming shortly. I submit that an abuse of the rules is involved here. I understand that there is only one more opportunity for questions to be answered before the de facto end of this session. I submit that the answer is available and the minister responsible knows the answer. He is refraining from replying because it will either embarrass him or someone in his office.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Although I disagree with the rule, it is provided that a minister is not required to answer a question. If that is the case, the minister should have the courage to stand up and say that he is not going to answer it. He should not use the subterfuge of undertaking to look into a question and provide an answer and then refuse to do so for fear of embarrassing someone very close to him, perhaps even himself.

[Mr. Lang.]

● (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Munro: Perhaps I might speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I realize the question has been on the order paper for some time, but in order to provide an answer to a question of this kind one must wait until all the necessary investigations have been completed. There is a time span involved. There is certainly no desire on my part to avoid giving an answer, and as soon as I am able to reply I will do so.

Mr. Woolliams: That is a weak excuse.

Mr. Orlikow: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On October 8 of last year I put question No. 79 on the order paper. As a matter of fact, the question was on the order paper last session, if I remember correctly. The question is not particularly difficult to answer. It asks who were the outside consultants, individuals or companies, who have undertaken studies or provided assistance to the Prime Minister's office or to the Privy Council office, what were their terms of reference and what remuneration they received. I submit that this is not a difficult question to answer. If the person responsible for answering the question had said that it would not be answered, I could have gone to the committee meeting at which the estimates of the Prime Minister's office were under consideration—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that it is not in order, on an alleged question of privilege, to make the kind of point the hon. member is making. There may be an argument on a point of order but certainly there is no question of privilege. I would hope that the hon. member having made his point, the matter might be allowed to stand for consideration.

Mr. McKinley: Mr. Speaker, question No. 1,048 has been on the Order Paper since March 2. I consider it extremely important and would appreciate an answer before the summer recess, if possible.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 201, 238 and 240 are acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential documents.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that notices of motions Nos. 201, 238 and 240 be deemed to have been accepted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.