

Fiji Islands	217
Other Oceania	1
Other Countries	39
Total	46,896

INTERNATIONAL BOOK YEAR

Question No. 156—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. When is International Book Year?
2. Has Canada made a commitment to participate in International Book Year and, if so, on what date?
3. What steps has Canada taken to observe International Book Year?
4. Has an amount been set aside for this project and, if so, what amount?
5. Who will be responsible for implementing projects?
6. What opportunity will there be for public participation?
7. What are the goals of Canada's participation in International Book Year?

[Translation]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. 1972 has been proclaimed "International Book Year" by UNESCO.

2. Canada has agreed to celebrate International Book Year on February 24.

3. The government has set up an interdepartmental committee consisting of interested departments and agencies under the chairmanship of the Department of the Secretary of State. Its purpose is to organize the activities of public and private bodies, particularly professional book associations.

4. Yes; the amount provided is \$400,000.

5. The Secretary of State.

6. The Secretary of State Department is organizing broad consultations in March with the provinces, numerous professional organizations and individuals interested in books, for the purpose of developing a complete program for the year and stimulating public participation.

7. The activities marking International Book Year are designed to encourage reading and awaken the public to the importance of books.

[English]

NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS FROM LE DAIN COMMISSION AS A RESULT OF DRUG POSSESSION OR TRAFFICKING

Question No. 211—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Since its inception, has anyone been suspended from the Le Dain Commission because of possession and for trafficking in hallucinogenic drugs and, if so (a) how many (b) how many of those suspended are still receiving a salary from the Le Dain Commission?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): (a) Yes. One person suspended for possession; (b) None.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise the matter of the failure of the government to answer starred questions. On March 1 I asked the following question, No. 242:

In what towns, villages, or municipal areas have projects under the local initiatives program been approved and in what amounts in the constituencies of (a) Saskatoon-Humboldt (b) Prince Albert (c) Saskatoon-Biggar?

Inquiries of the Ministry

There is no reason why that question should not be answered. The government has the information. They sent me an answer but it is altogether mixed up and wrong. I also asked question No. 243, which is not starred:

How many projects as of this date have been approved under the local initiatives program, and in what total amounts in (a) Saskatchewan (b) Alberta (c) Manitoba?

Sir, it is bad enough not to be able to get answers to questions asked orally in the House of Commons but it is worse when the government deliberately flouts the practice of the House with reference to starred questions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman is, of course, in error. The government never flouts any question asked by the right hon. gentleman, and I can assure him we will be looking into the matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Look into it—12 days late?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER CONCERNING REFUSAL BY PERSONS RECEIVING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS TO ACCEPT JOBS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I always feel strong in the presence of the hon. member for St. Boniface. I have a question for the right hon. the Prime Minister. In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister, and I quote, "You know, there are people on unemployment insurance who prefer not to work and they have a perfect right to make that decision", I would ask him when the laws of this country were changed to justify that statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must have missed something because I did not understand the question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nobody understood your statement.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the statement the Prime Minister made over the weekend that "there are people on unemployment insurance who prefer not to work and they have a perfect right to make that decision . . . should be no stigma attached to them . . . they paid their unemployment insurance", can the right hon. gentleman tell the House when the law of this country was changed to make—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have no objection to allowing the right hon. Prime Minister to answer but certainly that is argument. I suggest to the hon. gentleman who is asking the question that he might like to rephrase the question or ask a supplementary.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Prime Minister has made a statement inconsistent with the law of this country and which seems, on the face of it