

Inquiries of the Ministry

tabled prior to the end of the present session, and I explained to him that did not necessarily mean prior to the recess.

VETERANS AFFAIRS**REQUEST FOR MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. member for Ottawa West in his capacity as chairman of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. My question has to do with the report of the committee which he tabled a few minutes ago. Will the hon. member endeavour to ascertain through the usual channels whether hon. members of the House would be willing to concur in this report, without debate, if a motion for concurrence were moved tomorrow? I ask this question, believing he will find that to be the case.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I have filed with the Clerk of the House the necessary notice for concurrence. I believe, according to the rules, that 48 hours are required which would mean that Thursday would be the earliest day on which concurrence would be possible. Whether it will be possible to do so on that day is a matter for the House.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION**INCENTIVES PROGRAM—ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION WITH REGARD TO PELLETIZING PLANTS**

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of a question that my colleague for St. John's East directed to the Minister of Economic Expansion on Thursday last. The hon. member asked a question about the Regional Development Incentives Act, which has now been in operation for one year, and referred to the failure of the act in the two provinces that need it most, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland. I should like to ask the minister why, since close to \$25 million has been spent in the province of Quebec, close to \$5 million in the province of New Brunswick and about half a million dollars in the province of Saskatchewan, there is discrimination with regard to pelletizing plants, or are we to understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Certainly the question as asked is not in order.

[Mr. Munro.]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, may I re-word my question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the House will allow the hon. member to rephrase his question. No doubt he realizes that, since it was asked in an argumentative form, it was not acceptable. Perhaps the hon. member might like to rephrase his question.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister why grants have been given for pelletizing plants in the province of Quebec while applications for grants for such plants in the province of Saskatchewan were rejected?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I do not accept the statement that has been made, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

[*English*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that I did not hear the minister's first reply. He spoke in French and I did not have my earphone on. Subsequently he leaned across and said, "That is mean." Regardless of what he said, if my statement is incorrect I wish the minister would get up and correct me. I understand that my information is correct, and I do not see how I could have been mean. I should like to hear the minister's reply.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows that he has every right to ask questions under our rules, but he cannot insist on a reply. My understanding of the minister's reply was that he did not accept the premise on which the question was based, and it then becomes a question of debate as to what the situation is.

Mr. McIntosh: I thoroughly understand this, Mr. Speaker, but did the minister say he did not accept my statement or the premise of my statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I certainly do not think we should become involved in debate. My understanding is that the minister said, as ministers will sometimes say, that he did not accept the premise for the question.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious question so far as I am concerned. The minister is either doubting my word, or the information I have is correct. I should like the minister to clarify why he said I was mean.