

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

\* \* \*

### FINANCE

PROPOSAL THAT 3 PER CENT REBATE ON AUTOMOBILE INVENTORIES BE APPLIED TO DEALERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

Considering that the 3 per cent tax cut at the manufacturer's level which has been in force since November 17, 1978 will have a negative effect for car dealers, unless the measure is amended, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this 3 per cent tax cut applies on vehicles on inventory or in transit.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

\* \* \*

[English]

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POLICY RESPECTING FIREARMS CONTROL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I rise, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of the National Firearms Association's press release from Winnipeg today, stating that selected members of the Winnipeg police force have been given a special course on the new firearms control regulations and the stated objective is to disarm the Canadian public within the next five years, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That the Minister of Justice make a statement on motions today stating whether or not the stated purpose is government policy or in any way authorized by an order in council.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

### Oral Questions

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### TRANSPORT

AUDITOR GENERAL'S CRITICISM OF DEPARTMENT'S FINANCIAL CONTROL PROCEDURES

**Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. The Auditor General has documented, within the Department of Transport, items of poor financial control, cost overruns, poor contracting procedures and inefficient management which have totalled, in recent years, a cost to the taxpayer of \$572.2 million. How can the minister justify this appalling waste and his failure to adequately supervise the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the items to which the Auditor General referred very often occurred a number of years ago. In virtually every case, procedures have been put in place to try to make sure that whatever may have led to the problem in the first instance could not occur again. That has been a very important development for us.

In the case of airport facilities, for example, we have instituted very thorough, ongoing consultations with the users of facilities in order to have a complete double-check on the question of the scope of the needs for a particular facility.

**Mr. Murta:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister about two particular areas. First, the cost of the Calgary airport increased by some 255 per cent, from an original \$57.7 million to an estimated final cost of some \$127.4 million. From reading the Auditor General's report, it is apparent that the government proceeded without sufficient information on cost estimates, and incomplete, poor accounting and financial control procedures.

Can the minister assure the House that the sloppy and inefficient procedures which he just said were all right and which his department put in place have, in effect, been corrected?

**Mr. Lang:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is very much in mind. Since 1976, we have had procedures which guard against some of the problems that arose there. Of course, the statement that the original cost went from a certain figure to another figure may fail to take into account some very legitimate changes which occurred during the course of the construction period and from the planning period onward.

In the case of Calgary airport, we no doubt have an expensive facility. On the other hand, it reflects the very rapid growth of travel in and out of the city of Calgary and that whole area. In my view, the airport is only adequate having regard to the amount of growth we expect in the very near future. So while some of the expansion represents a change from the initial plan, a good deal of this change was desirable. This does not excuse the failure to adopt more stringent procedures as outlined by the Auditor General but, as I