

3. Is it anticipated that there will be an adequate supply of domestically produced electrical power in Quebec to replace, in whole or in part, the imported oil presently used for residential heating and, if so, by what date?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. There have been no formal discussions.

2. It is understood that an agreement has been signed between Hydro Quebec and the Power Authority of the State of New York. The terms of this agreement are subject to regulatory approval by the National Energy Board.

3. It is anticipated that adequate supplies of electrical energy can and will be available for electrical heating if and when conversion of oil heating equipment begins to take place in a significant way.

LIP—ASSISTANCE TO PIERREFOND, QUEBEC

Question No. 2,469—Mr. Cossitt:

1. Of the total \$688,751 granted in 1972-73 under the Local Initiatives Programme in the Constituency of Dollard, Quebec, how much was received by the Municipality of Pierrefonds for five projects and what is the breakdown of the figure (a) for construction of a sewage system, water pipeline and storm sewers for Lots 55, 62, 195 and 196 (b) for construction of a municipal garage (c) for construction of a storm sewage system between St. Jean and Paiement (d) for construction of a storm sewer system between Paiement and St. Charles (e) for verification and drafting of the registered survey of lands?

2. In each case, what is the (a) name and address of the contractor (b) amount of the contract (c) were tenders called and, if so (i) what were the names and addresses of all those who tendered (ii) the amount of each such tender?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): \$131,510.34; (a) \$31,590.00; (b) \$16,848.00; (c) \$39,879.45; (d) \$22,600.89; (e) \$20,592.00. Local Initiatives Program funds are provided to sponsors under a contract between the sponsor and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The department requires the sponsor to report the type of expenditure incurred, but the sponsor is at liberty to deal with whichever suppliers or contractors that he wishes. Information concerning contractors only comes to the attention of the department if it is mentioned in audit reports or is revealed as a result of some special enquiry. In the cases listed, no information is available to the department on the contracts concerned.

ENERGY CONSERVATION ADVERTISEMENT

Question No. 2,480—Mr. Cossitt:

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,913 which stated in part that the advertising agency "will not get a commission but a fee based on work done and overhead" (a) in what manner did the government arrange that there would be no commission received when the matter of commission by an advertising agency is an arrangement between the agency and the media rather than between agency and client (b) what happened to the commission (i) was it not asked for (ii) did the government pay the agency fee over and above the standard charge for advertising resulting in the taxpayers paying more for the advertisements than normal commercial usage (iii) did the government and its advertising agency indulge in any form of fee splitting and, if so, what are the details (c) what was the exact amount of the fee paid by the government to the advertising agency Vickers and Benson Ltd.?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: (a) The agency was advised that only production costs plus a reasonable profit would be paid since the advertisement was prepared largely within the department's own information branch. (b) It was used to buy additional energy conservation advertisements, booklets, etc. (i) Not applicable, (ii) No, (iii) No. (c) The fee was the production costs of the advertisement, which amounted to \$10,304, plus 25 per cent of those costs. This included 15,000 reprints of the advertisement for promotional purposes.

MR. JOSE DA LUZ

Question No. 2,549—Mr. Epp:

1. On what date did Mr. Jose Da Luz of Portugal receive landed immigrant status?

2. On what basis was his deportation order of April 26, 1973 quashed on March 27, 1974?

3. How many points did Mr. Da Luz receive out of the possible 100 on the immigration point system?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. August 7, 1974.

2. After reviewing the material submitted by the appellant and the respondent in support of the appeal lodged by Mr. DaLuz the Immigration Appeal Board considered that the exercise of discretion under section 15 of the Immigration Appeal Board Act was warranted.

3. On June 15, 1972, when assessed in accordance with Schedule A of the Immigration Regulations, Mr. DaLuz received 22 units of assessment. At an inquiry held on April 26, 1973, to determine whether Mr. DaLuz was a person who should be allowed to remain in Canada the special inquiry officer reviewed the original assessment and because of altered circumstances at that time awarded him 31 units of assessment.

LANGUAGE TRAINING—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Question No. 2,560—Mr. Herbert:

1. What are the total costs included in the 1975-76 Estimates of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for language training?

2. How are such costs divided between (a) salaries of personnel receiving instruction (b) salaries of instructional staff (c) additional or supplementary services to be purchased from the Public Service Commission (d) other costs?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. \$300,000.

2. (a) nil; (b) nil; (c) nil; (d) Staffing and Recruitment, \$39,000; Training and Development, \$27,000; Departmental Language Retention Training Program, \$60,000; Work Instruments, \$10,000; Administration of Official Language Program in the Department, \$164,000; Total, \$300,000.