

No. 1,474—*Mr. Nielsen*

1. Of the 55 recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry into certain disturbances at Kingston Penitentiary during April, 1971 and the Press Release of the Solicitor General dated March 1, 1973 concerning the report of the Commission, which of the 48 recommendations were fully implemented and which of the 48 recommendations were being implemented at the time the report was received?

2. Which of the 7 recommendations are still under study?

3. What criminal charges were laid against which inmates and in each case, what was the result of the trial?

4. Do any criminal charges remain outstanding against either inmates or correctional officers and, if so, what is the intended disposition of such charges?

5. Was any other disciplinary action taken against either inmates or correctional officers and, if so, against which inmates and which correctional officers and, in each instance, what was the disposition of such disciplinary action?

6. Has there been any increase or decrease in the number of personnel at Kingston Penitentiary since the presentation of the report of the Commission and, if so, what was or is the nature of the duty of each such personnel change?

7. Prior to the presentation of the report of the Commission were any limits, other than merit, imposed upon opportunities for promotion to senior positions?

8. What are the paramount criteria for promotion which are now in effect?

9. What is the present inmate population of Kingston Penitentiary?

10. How many (a) full-time and (b) part-time psychologists and/or psychiatrists are on the staff at Kingston Penitentiary?

11. What is the total number of staff now employed at Kingston Penitentiary and how many are engaged in each category of employment?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/1,474.

\*No. 1,488—*Mr. Masniuk*

1. How does the Department of the Secretary of State determine a grant in the area of travel and exchange for high school students?

2. What is the criterion used by the selection committee in determining the value of a specific project?

3. Who are the members of the selection committee?

4. Are Members of Parliament invited to participate in the work of the committee?

5. If a particular project has been refused by the selection committee, can their decision be appealed?

6. To whom, in what amounts and in what geographical areas have such grants been (a) approved (b) provided?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/1,488.

No. 1,686—*Mr. Matte*

1. What is the total number of employees in each department of the government?

2. What is the total number of employees in each Crown corporation?

3. What is the total number of employees in each government agency responsible to one department or another?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/1,686.

Mr. Comtois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Bill C-192, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (No. 2), was again considered in Committee of the Whole and progress having been made and reported the Committee obtained leave to consider it again at the next sitting of the House.

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of Income Tax Regulations, amendment, Order in Council P.C. 1972-1611, dated July 27, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 291-7/15.

The Order being read for the consideration of objections pursuant to the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act;

The following Notices of Objections to the proposed Electoral Districts of the Province of Quebec filed with Mr. Speaker on June 8 and 12, 1973, were considered:

That, pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970), consideration be given by this House to the matter of an objection to the provisions of the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec laid before this House by Mr. Speaker on Monday, May 14, 1973, on the grounds set forth hereafter:

(1) The Commission made no allowance for geographic and economic considerations, and ignored or neglected problems of communication within and between the proposed districts;

(2) Except for Montreal, physical, social and economic cohesion is ignored in the proposed districts, thus destroying communities of interest and making adequate representation practically impossible;

(3) The geographic and demographic differences created by the proposed redistribution make the member's task even more difficult, especially in rural areas;

(4) The Commission failed to apply the provisions of the statute for a population differential of up to 25 per