

the names of individual employees and the costs involved in specific program projects. The background to this custom is explained in detail in the reply to question No. 2,530, answered November 6, 1975.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Question No. 3,891—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to question No. 3,027 given on February 15, 1982 and which stated "See response to question No. 3,273 answered on December 17, 1981", for what reason was the answer to question No. 3,027 delayed until two months after a similar question was answered, which had been placed on the Order Paper after question No. 3,027?

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions and does not consider it appropriate to provide information about internal administrative arrangements.

* * *

[English]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, if question No. 2,284 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. It is the pleasure of the House that question No. 2,284 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

CONTRACTING OF PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES
PERSONNEL BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Question No. 2,284—**Mr. Blenkarn:**

Were persons employed by private employment agencies under contract to government departments and agencies during the fiscal years 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80 and, if so (a) how many (b) by which department and, for each department, how many and for what term (c) what was the cost (d) what was the average term of each person's employment (e) how many were (i) male (ii) female?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Housing

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT
CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION
ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, February 25, 1982, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cosgrove that Bill C-89, to amend the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Madam Speaker, once again it is a pleasure to speak on Bill C-89. The other night I managed to get in perhaps ten minutes, at which time I dealt with some of the remarks of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) who belaboured his concern and the concern of his party about the absence of property rights in the Constitution when dealing with the mortgage and housing portions of the bill. I had to say then, and I repeat now, that this kind of argument is being used around the country in some way or the other to indicate that this government is not concerned about property rights—

• (1710)

An hon. Member: It isn't.

Mr. McRae:—when the hon. member knew, as they all knew, that this was a matter strictly within the realm of the provinces.

Miss MacDonald: Why was it accepted?

Mr. McRae: Most of the provinces had Tory governments. They were very much concerned that we move into this area.

Mr. McDermid: NDP blackmail.

Mr. McRae: The fact that the rights were not included in the bill of rights in no way changes the relationship of property in terms of the provinces and the property rights of individuals.

Mr. Taylor: Why did you put it in in the first place, then?

Mr. McRae: The other point which the Tory party often mentions, and which the hon. member mentioned, is the whole question of the mortgage deductibility scheme.

Some hon. Members: Right on.

Mr. McRae: The Tory party did not stay around long enough to have that scheme enacted. But I think there are many reasons why that was an untimely bill. First, given the amount of freedom with indexing, and so on, which ministers of finance have, it meant that the minister of finance was tied almost totally to mortgage deductibility. It was the only thing he could add given the restrictions on money. It meant that \$2