This can cause some problems. We have heard stories about a pile of parcels being left in the lobby of a highrise. We have heard of casual employees taking parcels home at night because they did not get them all delivered.

As the Chairperson of the New Democratic Caucus I say that we do not approve of the way Canada Post is treating the mail of Canadians. We want to have a public inquiry into the way the Post Office conducts its business.

How many children are going to look under the tree on Christmas morning and see nothing but a little card from Canada Post that says: "Sorry, but we just couldn't manage to get your presents to you on time"?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

CANADA LANDS COMPANY

ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING MEMBER FOR ARGENTEUIL— PAPINEAU—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and concerns the sad and shocking story of the Canada Lands Corporation (Mirabel). Yesterday, Canadians were informed by the media that the Hon. Member for Argenteuil—Papineau had confirmed she had asked the president of the Canada Lands Corporation at Mirabel, Mr. Pierre Hardy, to award, without tender, a contract worth \$42,000 for supervising vacant lots to a Conservative organizer, the owner of a brewery.

Today, according to the media, Gérard Poirier's son claimed that the Hon. Member for Argenteuil—Papineau and President Hardy had made threats to the effect that if Mr. Poirier dared to expose the Mirabel scandal, he would lose the right to buy back his land.

In the light of the last two revelations, is the Prime Minister prepared, first of all, to expel the Member in question from caucus; second, to fire the president of the Canada Lands Corporation at Mirabel immediately; and third, to order a royal commission of inquiry to investigate this scandal?

[English]

Hon. Stewart McInnes (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, all of those allegations have been denied. Throughout the week the Hon. Member has been raising a number of suggestions about wrongdoings involving alleged friends of Tories.

Allow me to refer very quickly to the case of the celebrated Gervais Desrochers who received, between the years 1981 and 1984, eight contracts from the previous administration with regard to Mirabel whereas, between the years 1984 and 1987, he received only two.

Oral Questions

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McInnes: Allow me to refer to the operational expenditures of Mirabel between April 1, 1981, and September of 1984. They totalled \$34 million, whereas from September of 1984 to 1987 they were only \$20 million.

Allow me to bring to the attention of this honourable House that the former Government spent \$15 million in the 1970s, which included \$2 million for advertising without any result, whereas in the last three years \$8 million in new investment has been secured for the Mirabel industrial park, and \$100 million in lawsuits have been settled in the last two years with the exclusion of only 3 per cent. That is performance.

Mr. Boudria: Anything but an answer to the question, Mr. Speaker.

SALE OF MIRABEL PROPERTIES

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works. It is with regard to the sale of properties at Mirabel.

How can the Minister justify to the House that some of the properties which were sold are the exact same properties we will have to buy back to build a highway for the airport? What possible reason is there for doing such things other than giving taxpayers' dollars to friends of the Conservative Party?

Hon. Stewart McInnes (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, this is the ultimate in humour for 1987. The debacle created by the previous administration at Mirabel is without precedent.

With regard to the allegations of my friend, I prefer to rely on the analysis and judgment of the Auditor General, and the special audit team which has expressed time and again that it has found no evidence of wrongdoing.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, it is correct that it is without precedent. There is no doubt about that.

EXPENDITURE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. We now have three Tory organizers recompensed, two sets of documents not filed on time, one law suit, one murder, three RCMP investigations, two audits, a relative—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member will know, as do all Hon. Members, that there are often very difficult matters which have to be raised in Question Period. However, the preamble to a question ought to be to state the alleged facts on which the question is set. As I have indicated to the House on other occasions, it is not appropriate to use the preamble to set a lot of charges against any individual or individuals.