

*Supply—Resources and Development*

Corporation, the minister says, are to pay for restoration of the houses that they own. What is the position of the house the ownership of which has been transferred to a purchaser? Will Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation take any responsibility for it?

**Mr. Winters:** If the ownership has been transferred to somebody else, then the arrangement would fall, I should think, on the same plan that is worked out for the general restoration of houses in Winnipeg.

**Mr. Bryce:** These men would pay for them?

**Mr. Winters:** Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation would of course be in a position to pay only for repairs on the houses they own.

**Mr. Bryce:** I am quite clear on that now. Those that have not been sold will be looked after by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation; those on which somebody has made a down payment, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will not be responsible for.

**Mr. Fraser:** I want to say a couple of words on the national film board. Personally I feel that parliament is not yet in a position to know exactly what is happening there.

**Mr. Winters:** I wonder whether the hon. member heard me. I said that when we come to the national film board I will make a statement. I would prefer a discussion at that stage, if it is satisfactory to hon. members.

**Mr. Fraser:** I am in the same position as the minister was; he could not hear, and I could not hear.

**Mr. Knowles:** I should like to call the attention of the minister to answers that were given to certain questions of mine, the answers being found in sessional paper No. 67J, tabled on Wednesday, May 10, 1950. This is another of those occasions on which, although we are invited to ask questions so as to get information, we receive returns which frequently fail to give that information. In this sessional paper are a number of questions, all of which do not apply to this department, but some of which do.

My third question was:

What federal public works projects have been undertaken in order to relieve unemployment since September 1, 1949?

The answer to that question, given by the Department of Resources and Development, reads as follows:

3. The federal government's program of public investment, including public works, consists of worthwhile projects which will contribute toward the development of the country, and which can be implemented at such times as they will contribute to the maintenance of a high level of employment.

[Mr. Bryce.]

In line with this policy, projects undertaken by all government departments since September 1, 1949, had full regard to the employment situation.

I suggest there is a clear inference in this last sentence, namely that there were projects undertaken by government departments since September 1, 1949, and that those projects had full regard to the employment situation.

All right. Assuming from that answer that there were such projects, I draw the minister's attention to the following four questions I asked in relation thereto:

4. What number of persons have been employed thereon?

5. How much money has been spent thereon?

6. To whom have contracts for such works been awarded?

7. In what areas have such works been undertaken?

Surely those are specific questions calling for precise answers. But the answer of the Department of Resources and Development is as follows:

4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 3.

As the minister knows, we have far too many of these. The hon. member for Lake Centre gave an example the other day. If there had been no projects undertaken, the answer to questions 4, 5, 6 and 7 could be "Nil," or "Covered by the previous answer". But the answer to question 3 implies that, in line with this policy, projects undertaken by all government departments since September 1, 1949, had full regard to the employment situation. If there were such projects, then the minister's department should have answered my specific questions 4, 5, 6 and 7.

I shall not take further time to discuss the matter. But I would like to have the minister's promise to have this sessional paper looked at again, with a view to seeing if I can be given more precise answers to questions 4, 5, 6 and 7 in sessional paper 67J.

**Mr. Winters:** Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the sessional paper and the contents of it. The government investment program is not of course the responsibility of any one department. On the contrary it is a matter involving expenditures by all government departments. If the hon. member will refer to the estimates, as he has done on more than one occasion, he will see a great many votes for a great many projects in, for example, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Transport, the Department of Resources and Development, and other departments. Those projects are undertaken from time to time, and in each case before a project is begun full regard is had to the employment situation obtaining in the area concerned. That is what was intended by the explanation given in the sessional paper.