

MIRABEL AIRPORT

Question No. 3,119—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did the Prime Minister say at the opening of the new Mirabel Airport: "The Torontonians will be down here on their knees" and, if so (a) for what reason did he make the statement (b) what is the full meaning of the statement (c) was it meant as a public affront to the people of Ontario and Toronto in particular?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): See Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms Citation 171(1).

* * *

[English]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 1,583 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[Text]

PRESIDENT OF CIDA

Question No. 1,583—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Under the rules of protocol, does the President of CIDA take precedence over the Prime Minister and/or Cabinet Ministers in certain foreign countries?

2. Are the citizens of certain foreign countries led to believe that the President of CIDA is supreme over the Prime Minister and/or Cabinet Ministers?

3. (a) What are the responsibilities and duties of the President of CIDA (b) how many persons are on his personal staff (c) what is the total staff of CIDA?

4. (a) What is the name of the President (b) on what date does his appointment expire (c) what is his salary?

5. (a) What are the names of all employees of CIDA (b) what are their salaries?

6. What persons, firms, companies and organizations, have received monies and/or contracts from CIDA and what are their names, the amounts of the contracts and the officers and personal shareholders or owners?

7. (a) Through what Minister does CIDA report to Parliament (b) on what date was the last report tabled (c) on what date will the next report be made?

Return tabled.

● (1500)

[English]

Mr. Blais: I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to do with the first three questions on the order paper, Nos. 28, 62 and 69, which I placed on the order paper on September 30. They were on the order paper in the previous parliament, and remain unanswered. Two questions concern the Prime Minister. One has to do with designers, architects and others who have been employed at heavy public expense on projects at 24 Sussex Drive. Surely the answer to that question is straightforward.

The second question deals with the numerous journeys the Prime Minister has made at public expense. The answer to that too, I should think, is straightforward. The

Anti-Inflation Act

third question concerns my constituency: the Post Office Department moved the post office from premises in the village of Lyndhurst, for which the rental had been \$120 per year, to similar premises for which the department pays \$5,500 per year. Such a rent increase may not seem important to the high-spending people opposite, but I suggest that when the rent goes from \$120 a year to \$5,500, something smells.

That question should have been answered long ago: it has been on the order paper for a year and a half. I have raised these matters a good many times, and I suggest that the parliamentary secretary or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)—who has left—ought to tell us why these answers have been outstanding for so long.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR RESTRAINT OF PROFIT MARGINS, PRICES, DIVIDENDS AND COMPENSATION

The House resumed, from Friday, October 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-73, to provide for the restraint of profit margins, prices, dividends and compensation in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, the government white paper opens its text with this deathless prose saying "Canada is in the grip of serious inflation." The government has suddenly discovered inflation. On Friday, during the short time available, I asked what were the reasons for the government's apparent *volte-face*; what were the reasons behind the government's flip-flop, as it were, with regard to an incomes policy or wage and price controls? To include rents as well—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order, please. I ask hon. members to carry out their conversations behind the curtains and allow the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) to continue his remarks.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I know that important government decisions must be taken, but not here on the floor.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): They are usually ad hoc.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): They are ad hoc. For all we know, they may be contemplating a tax change right now, as happened suddenly not long ago when the decision to change an excise tax provision was made in this House during conversation.

I want to know whether this is a bona fide policy or whether the government's sudden change was motivated by other reasons. Why did the Prime Minister (Mr. Tru-