

Oral Questions

ered bid to a close relative of a Minister of the Crown? It is very clear. Can we get a yes or no answer?

• (1450)

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): I think there is a contradiction in the Hon. Member's suggestion of an untendered bid. I just want to be absolutely clear. I see the point that the Hon. Member is trying to bring forward, and I agree with him. I agree very much that the conflict of interest regulations should be very severe in regard to all of our associations and all of our families. I accept that, and always have, and said it right from the beginning. What I do not accept, and what I reject with the greatest of vigour, is the implication that any person, including someone sitting in the back benches of the Liberal Party, can have the temerity and impunity to try to slander the integrity of a most honourable Canadian. That I am not going to put up with.

Mr. Deans: We are not doing that.

Mr. Mulroney: In fairness, I will agree with the Hon. Member; I limited my comments to that great Canadian. But I responded fully to your concerns and I think the Member will be well pleased with the severity of the regulations as brought in.

APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. I would like to ask him whether he feels the conflict of interest guidelines apply to him, and if he can tell us whether immediately upon assuming the Prime Ministership of this country he resigned all of his corporate directorships?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Long before that.

LABSEA INCORPORATED DIRECTORSHIP

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Well, can the Prime Minister tell this House why it took him almost two and a half months after he assumed the Prime Ministership of this country to resign from Labsea Incorporated, a company in which he shared the directorship with his great and good friend Frank Moores?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): I will be happy to. I resigned from all of the publicly and privately held companies with which I was associated long before becoming Prime Minister. It may be that there were either charitable organizations or universities, or some private companies in which I would have had either a minor interest, or a directorship on a hospital board, or some such thing like that. I will be happy to check the record. My principle, which I set out and which I followed, was to resign absolutely all of my business holdings. If there is an exception to that, I can assure you that,

(a), it would have been inadvertent and, (b), it would have been of no profit to me.

* * *

THE DISABLED AND THE HANDICAPPED

TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS—RATUSHNY REPORT
RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Can he report to the House on the progress being made with respect to the implementation of the Ratushny report which deals with the transportation requirements of handicapped Canadians?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the House that the recommendations brought down by Professor Ratushny were excellent recommendations. I should also advise the House that we have been working very closely with the Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. It would be my intention within the next couple of weeks or so to announce a plan for the implementation of the recommendations which have been brought forward by Professor Ratushny, and also the recommendations brought forward by the Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. I should say as well that we will be designating the Minister of State for Transport as responsible Minister for all matters relating to accessibility for handicapped and senior citizens.

* * *

CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

TORONTO RENTAL INCREASES

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour, who is also responsible for CMHC. On April 16 I asked him why his Department was planning to increase rents in CMHC controlled apartments by in excess of 10 per cent, including the Main Square apartment complex in Toronto. The Minister replied that the present Government was raising the rent in order to recover from the previous administration's six and five program.

Does the Government not realize that many of the individuals in those buildings were already victimized by the previous administration's six and five program? Why are the Government and the Minister trying to stick it to these people again? How many other groups are going to be victims of this kind of thing?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the Hon. Member once again that the rent increases are made subject to the guidelines of the Rent Review Board in the Province of Ontario and can be substantiated before that board. The Hon. Member should also be made aware that in the Main Square project some 25 per cent of the units are rent geared to income, and if by increasing the