

## AIRPORTS

## FOOD AND LIQUOR CONCESSION AT DORVAL

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport: it arises out of the rather extraordinary arrangement involving a 20-year monopoly to a food and liquor concessionaire at Montreal's Dorval airport. I understand this contract will be up for renewal. Can the minister assure this House that tenders will be called for this concession? Also, will he ensure that the details with regard to sales, rent and other pertinent data will be made available to all other interested parties who may be wanting to bid on this concession?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport and Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to which specific concession the hon. member is referring. However, I can tell him it is our standing practice to go to tender in connection with concessions. There are sometimes special reasons for deviating from that practice; those are always plain and available. I do not contemplate that at this particular time.

The question of what information is available has concerned me for some time. A couple of years ago we began to make it clear in our contracts with concessionaires that information required for future tendering would be made available publicly. We had not done it prior to that time. There are some contractual and other questions which arise about how far we can go with information in those circumstances.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I will bring the minister up to date. The firm involved is known as AFC. In view of the fact this seems to be a rather extraordinary case, will the minister take the House into his confidence and make a statement on motions outlining the facts with regard to this concession? Also, will he determine, during the course of his investigation, whether there are any other monopoly franchise-type arrangements with the MOT? Since the whole tendering process within the Ministry of Transport has been drawn into question, will the minister consider reviewing the whole tendering process and clearly enunciate a policy in that regard?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I am indeed reviewing the whole tendering process, particularly in terms of the kinds of conditions and limits that sometimes have been imposed in the bidding proposals. I have wanted to maximize the amount of competition in bidding and have already taken many steps in that regard. For example, in connection with catering concessions, we have ensured that the information about proposals is made available to as many local people as possible who might have an interest. The result has been a very greatly increased number of bids received in connection with the tenders being sought. I think this is a very good and satisfactory solution and that continued effort in that regard is warranted. We shall continue the effort.

*Privilege—Mrs. Holt*

● (1502)

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

## PENALTIES FOR VANDALISM

**Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. It has to do with a petition circulated recently by the town of Trenton regarding vandalism: it was circulated to all municipalities in Ontario.

In the light of this petition, which requests that the federal-provincial authorities meet with municipal officials to discuss a change in the law, imposing heavier penalties and restitution in vandalism cases, would the minister tell us whether he plans any such action?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport and Minister of Justice):** I would ordinarily be very happy to raise this question with provincial attorneys general, but I would expect the initiative to come from them if they are dissatisfied with enforcement provisions which apply to any section of the Criminal Code.

**Mr. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton):** Acts of wanton destruction and senseless vandalism are increasing at a frightening rate. Since it appears that the present laws are an ineffective deterrent to these crimes, can the minister explain his reluctance to take positive action in this area?

**Mr. Lang:** There is no reluctance on my part. I indicated I would be very happy to consult with the attorneys general on this question, but if their feeling agrees with that expressed by the hon. member, obviously they would have brought the matter to my attention before this.

\* \* \*

## PRIVILEGE

MRS. HOLT—AFFRONT BY COMMISSIONER FAIBISH, MEMBER OF CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Two days ago the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) raised, by way of a question of privilege, an occurrence which had taken place before a hearing of the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission in the province of British Columbia.

The hon. member related to us an experience which, in her opinion, interfered with her right as a member of parliament to appear and adequately discharge before that commission—which is a federal commission—her responsibilities to her constituents, some of whom were present at the hearing to which she made reference. I have no doubt that the hon. lady was acting in a capacity which she considered to be an essential part of her function as a member of the House of Commons.

As I indicated at the time the question was raised, the difficulty we face is not whether a member is acting in a