

STATISTICS CANADA RESEARCH EXPENDITURES

Question No. 293—**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 Statistics Canada 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?

Return tabled.

PROSECUTIONS FOR MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Question No. 754—**Mr. Fleming:**

What are the latest statistics available on prosecutions for misleading advertising (a) the names of these companies (b) the number of times these companies have been charged and the number of convictions placed upon them?

Return tabled.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with reference to question No. 107. This question has been on the order paper since February 27. It is a very simple one. It seeks statistical information regarding the strength of federal government departments and agencies in Newfoundland, and I fail to see why I cannot get an answer.

Mr. Foster: I will be pleased to look into the matter and report to the hon. member soon.

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on three different occasions, April 16, April 17 and May 6, I have called attention to the statement the parliamentary secretary made with respect to question No. 319. On April 15 the hon. member stated that it cost the taxpayers of this country \$1.5 million to reply to this question which shows the inquiries of this government toward the women of Canada. I rose on a question of privilege on April 16 and 17 to protest the statement made by the parliamentary secretary on the ground that it interferes with the right of members to seek information from the government.

I deny that the statement he made is true. On April 17, the government House leader promised that the parliamentary secretary would furnish the House with an explanation of his extraordinary statement. I have now learned, in relation to my repeated requests for an answer to question No. 319, that answers had been prepared by departments and forwarded to the minister in March. It has since been discovered that personnel officers in the departments have been asked to inform parliamentary return officers how long it actually took to prepare the answers, the dates when they were completed, and when the answers went to the minister's office. It was also learned that there is an unwritten procedure by which, if an officer feels a question on the order paper would cost more than \$200 to answer, he must inform the parliamentary returns officer who would then determine whether the preparation of an answer should be undertaken.

In the case of question No. 319 relating to salaries paid to women, no indication was in fact given that the cost of preparing the answer would exceed \$200, and the answer

Motions for Papers

was prepared without further consideration as a matter of routine procedure. The fact that questions were later asked with a view to finding out the date on which the answers were, in fact, ready, together with the fact that those responsible for preparing the answers did not inform the minister's assistant that the cost would exceed \$200, makes it clear that the statement by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River is false and misleading. If he does not withdraw, I ask the minister to apologize to the House for him, and if the minister does not have enough guts to withdraw that false statement, the Prime Minister might lower himself and withdraw on behalf of the chicken-hearted minister and his parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in regard to question No. 50. I have asked on several occasions in the House recently why this question has not been answered, what reason there was for the delay. The question has been on the order paper since away back in the last session. I had not intend to bring the matter up again today, but since the question concerns trips made by the Prime Minister to Liberal gatherings at public expense, and in light of the Prime Minister's obvious change of heart a few minutes ago in becoming price conscious on the eve of an election, I thought he might be prepared to let us know, this afternoon, when this question might be answered.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has asked many questions about the expense of maintaining the Sussex Drive and Harrington Lake properties and all those questions have been answered except one, I believe, which concerns work that has only been completed recently. I can give the member a guarantee that, as the other questions have been answered, this one will be answered later this session.

Mr. Forrestall: Also on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the parliamentary secretary that on a previous occasion I expressed concern that a series of questions on the order paper dated February 28 have not been answered, in particular, question No. 220 which asks why there is no audit of the Unemployment Insurance Commission in the report of the Auditor General. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary could take note of this question, which is not starred but perhaps should be, and respond if we are here tomorrow.

Mr. Foster: I will be pleased to look into the matter the hon. member has raised. I would note that 54 per cent of all the questions placed on the order paper have been answered to date this session.

An hon. Member: Is that all?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers stand.