

Oral Questions

justify the loss of tens of thousands of jobs across Canada?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Forestry)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Hon. Member has recognized the important achievements that have been made over the last four years. Hundreds of millions of seedlings have been planted, literally thousands of jobs have been created in silviculture and in forest farming. Hundreds of millions of hectares of land have been restocked and are treated effectively now, and of course, six of the agreements that have expired are presently being renegotiated with the provinces, and hopefully quite soon we will be in a position to enter into a new generation of those kinds of co-operative agreements that have proven so successful in the past.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT CANADA**CANCELLATION OF RELOCATION
PROJECT—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works and concerns the Conservative Government's decision to cancel its plan to relocate Transport Canada to new accommodation. Could the Minister inform the House why the Government provoked this whole controversy by cancelling the bidding process? And above all, could he explain why the Government has decided to negotiate with only one party, Mr. Robert Campeau, who supports the Prime Minister's free trade policy, instead of using a more democratic and more open system, which is the bidding process?

[*English*]

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is a very important decision and it falls into the general constraints that this Budget has placed on my Department along with other Departments. This decision was not one that was easily taken, but it was part of the budgetary process and reflects the general constraints that were placed on public works.

• (1530)

Mr. Boudria: I guess this is what the Prime Minister used to call "you dance with the one that brought you".

RENEWAL OF LEASE

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

The Minister says in his *Budget Papers* that the cancellation of this particular item will result in a saving of \$2 million. Given that the renewal of the existing lease will not result in any saving and as a matter of fact will be more expensive than getting a different lease according to the bids already known, why did the Minister of Finance pretend in his Budget to save money when he is spending more money?

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, would that this question were as simplistic to answer as the Hon. Member thinks it is, this particular Public Works project along with others have been curtailed.

There have been projects curtailed in Vancouver and in other parts of the country. It is by no means certain, depending on what statistics you use, that the savings the Hon. Member attributes to continuing the project would be any more than cancelling the project. It depends on whose statistics you believe and whose arguments you accept. He is having the same problem in his own Party, as he knows.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE**NATIONAL DRUG STRATEGY—ZERO TOLERANCE**

Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the Minister of National Revenue.

I am sure that all Members of this House applaud the Minister's fight against the drug problem. However, the Minister was quoted in a number of articles last week as saying that the Government is seriously considering pursuing the policy of zero tolerance as a method of combating the drug problem in Canada.

Considering the less than successful record of this extremely controversial program in the United States, is the Minister so naive as to believe that zero tolerance alone will resolve the drug problem in Canada?