

## Order Paper Questions

say in passing, whenever members of the House get into the unfortunate habit or practice of departing from the subject matter of debate at the moment and get into personal references of any sort about members. It occasionally happens in the heat of debate, and we all experience that. I think we all learn the lesson that when this happens, the reason it has been traditionally ruled a disorder—when it does occur—is for the simple reason that it is never really truly relevant to the subject matter under debate. If hon. members can bring themselves to refrain from the practice of departing from the subject matter of debate and getting on to either the qualifications, personal or otherwise, of members or their own personal record or performance, certainly a good deal of this difficult could be avoided.

However, I do say to the hon. member for Athabasca, to the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) and others who participated in this discussion, that it did raise problems that are not isolated and are very serious.

I think I have made my feelings clear about some of the aspects of the problems that are before us. I do want to assure hon. members that in launching into the work, largely, as I say, at the initiation of the hon. member for Peace River, on the study here in this parliament—over which I will preside—of the rights and immunities of members of the House of Commons, not only will the work of the select committee in the United Kingdom form a very important working paper for us, but this experience will certainly be given very careful consideration in the deliberations and work of that committee, in the hope that we can expose some clear guidelines for the protection of hon. members in situations of this sort and a clearer understanding of privilege as it relates to these kinds of situations.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Eleventh report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs—Mr. Robinson.

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Mr. Rompkey.

[Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,148 and 4,967.

[Text]

## GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO FOREX INC.

Question No. 3,148—Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve):

1. In (a) 1969 (b) 1970 (c) 1971 (d) 1972 (e) 1973 (f) 1974 (g) 1975, what amount was granted by the government to the group known as FOREX Inc.?

2. In (a) 1969 (b) 1970 (c) 1971 (d) 1972 (e) 1973 (f) 1974 (g) 1975, what amounts were granted by the government to sawmill companies operating in the Constituency of Villeneuve?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. In that the Employment Support Program has been disbanded the information is not readily available.

2. Records of grants to companies are not maintained on a Constituency basis. However, an estimated total of \$200,000 has been granted to sawmill companies in the region by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce during the period 1969-1975.

1. The total amount granted by the government to FOREX, Inc., under the authority of the Regional Development Incentives Act, reads as follows: (a) In 1969: none. (b) In 1970: none. (c) In 1971: none. (d) In 1972: none. (e) In 1973: \$409,268. (f) In 1974: \$176,252. (g) To September 30, 1975: none.

2. The total amount granted by the Department to sawmill companies and connected firms in the Constituency of Villeneuve, reads as follows: (a) In 1969: none. (b) In 1970: \$465,950. (c) In 1971: \$1,060,875. (d) In 1972: \$1,226,323. (e) In 1973: none. (f) In 1974: \$84,867. (g) To September 30, 1975: \$199,400.

## FREIGHT ASSISTANCE IN ATLANTIC REGION

Question No. 4,967—Mr. Forrestall:

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,507, what were the amounts paid to each company listed in the answer to Parts 2 and 3?

2. Is the information available by company in the same manner as subsidies or assistance to the railways and, if not for what reason?

3. What is the government's estimate of payments for the year 1975?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1.

Payments under the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act

1974-75 Fiscal Year

Intra-Regional

Eastern Transport Limited	\$571,948.54
Moffat Brothers Moving & Storage Ltd.	426,378.28
Day and Ross Ltd.	378,730.54
Road and Sea Transport Ltd.	369,131.92
Thompson Transfer Co. Ltd.	354,139.12
M & D Transfer Ltd.	223,490.69
Brunswick Petroleum Transport Ltd.	172,792.69
Easson's Limited	152,909.74
Roch Roy Transport Ltée	145,544.89
Cement Cartage Co. Ltd.	145,449.18
Midland Transport Limited	139,322.27
G. M. Armour & Son Ltd.	137,114.51
Roy's Midway Transfer	133,533.02
Bowness Transport Ltd.	124,902.07
Heffler Trucking Ltd.	120,534.75