

Development Limited, with regard to the federally-owned slip and, if so, on what date did the property transfer take place and in what manner?

5. If the property transfer did in fact take place, did the government consult with the Government of the Province of Ontario and the Kingston City Council prior to the sale and, if so, on what dates did such discussions take place?

6. (a) What were the names of the officers, directors and shareholders of Dunleary Investments Limited and Murney Development Limited in November, 1972 (b) have there been any changes in the directorship of these companies since November 1972?

7. What are the names of the signatories to the agreement or deed that transferred the slip in Kingston Harbour from the government to the firms of Dunleary Investments Limited and Murney Development Limited?

8. What sales, quit-claims, leases or other transfers of property have been made of Kingston Harbour lands since the 1955 quit-claim from the City of Kingston (a) to whom were they made (b) what were the locations and sizes of the parcels (c) how much money was received for each parcel (d) what is the length of the leases (e) what were the dates of the transactions (f) who were the directors and shareholders of the companies involved (g) which transfers were made for lands that were under agreement or purchase contracts to other companies or individuals (h) who were the directors and shareholders of these secondary companies?

9. Was the Department of Transport requested by the City of Kingston to straighten out the ownership problems in Kingston Harbour and, if so (a) on what date (b) what action has been taken since then?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,750.

No. 2,813—*Mr. Rodriguez*

What were the names of the recipients of grants or loans under the Programme for Export Market Development in each of the fiscal years 1972-73 (January 1, 1973 to end) and 1973-74 to date and what were the amounts in each case?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,813.

No. 2,816—*Mr. Rodriguez*

1. What were the names of corporations benefitting from the Accelerated Capital Cost Allowance Programme (ACCA) for pollution-control structures and equipment, in each of the fiscal years 1965-66 to 1972-73 (January 1 to end) and 1973-74 to date and, in each case, what were the costs allowed under the Programme for rapid write-off?

2. What are the qualifications of the staff employed in assessing whether the equipment or structures specified in an application for cost allowance are capable of reducing, abating or eliminating a pollution problem and what standards are used in defining reduction, abatement and elimination?

3. What inspection reports have been prepared assessing the performance of the equipment or structures in reducing, abating or eliminating a pollution problem?

4. Where performance has been found to be unsatisfactory, what measures have been taken to ensure improvement or recover cost allowances?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,816.

No. 2,874—*Mr. Nystrom*

1. What were the amounts of money spent by the National Research Council on publicity and/or information in each of the fiscal years 1972-73 and 1973-74 to date?

2. What were the names and addresses of firms and individuals who received these contracts, what amounts of money were spent in each case and what was the purpose of each contract?

3. In the case of expenditures for publicity and/or information made within the Department by its publicity or information division, what was the amount in each case and the purpose of the expenditure?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,874.

No. 2,922—*Mr. Nystrom*

1. What was the total amount of money spent in each of the fiscal years 1972-73 and 1973-74 to date by the National Research Council on contracts to outside persons and organizations for research, development and other consulting services?

2. What are the names and addresses of these outside persons and organizations and what amounts of money were involved in each contract?

3. What was the purpose of each contract and title of each report submitted?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,922.

No. 2,954—*Mr. Atkey*

1. Does the government intend to intervene as a friend of the court in the class action No. 3495 - 73 now before the Supreme Court of Ontario against General Motors of Canada on behalf of Helen Naken, Stephen Cranson, William Pearce, Robert Vandiera and all others who purchased new 1971 and 1972 Firenza automobiles?

2. Were Firenza owners forced to rely almost solely on the Automobile Protection Association for aid in their attempt to obtain redress of their grievances from General Motors and, if so, is the government considering the permanent provision of funds to APA, which now operates under a LIP grant, to guarantee its continued existence or the provision of funds to other similar automobile consumer groups?

3. What criteria were employed to select the seven Firenza automobiles chosen for the study by the Department of Transport, Road and Motor Vehicle Traffic Safety Branch of July 16, 1973?

4. For what reason did the Road and Motor Vehicle Traffic Safety Branch consider that seven was a sufficient sample on which to conclude that the safety of the highways was not endangered by the Firenza automobiles?

5. Has the government considered increasing the powers and facilities of the Accidents and Defect Investigations Division of the Road and Motor Vehicle Traffic