

tions have caused or are causing genuine hardship for Canadian producers and their employees.

2. Members of the industry have alleged that they are facing hardships as a result of the tariff reduction. As indicated on pages 5724 and 5725 of *Hansard* of July 17, 1973, officials of the Department of Finance wrote to the Canadian Mobile Home and Travel Trailer Association in May asking that a date be set for a meeting to discuss the industry's representations. The Association was also asked to provide further information in support of the representations. To date there has only been an acknowledgment from the Association.

\* \* \*

### QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

#### GRANTS IN AID TO BILINGUALISM

Question No. 772—**Mr. Matte:**

1. What amounts were granted in aid to bilingualism in 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972 in (a) the Province of Quebec (b) the other provinces?

2. How many of the bills introduced during the 4th Session of the 28th Parliament were originally drafted in French?

Return tabled.

**Mr. Lawrence:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Not quite two weeks ago today Your Honour ruled me out of order when I attempted to ask an oral question relating to a matter about which we are actually in special session, namely, the estimated cost of the Food Prices Review Board. Your Honour indicated that it should be placed on the order paper. I immediately placed the question on the order paper. The answer must be within the immediate knowledge of the government, and if there is to be an honest attempt on both sides of the House to sharpen up the question period I certainly think some of these urgent questions should be answered more quickly.

● (1430)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cossitt:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to questions 2271 to 2280 inclusive requesting the names of lawyers whose services are being used by the government in the various provinces to carry out legal work. This is the sixth time I have raised a similar point of order. On the last occasion, one week ago today, the parliamentary secretary told the House he had not yet obtained definite information from the Department of Justice as to when answers would be forthcoming. I would think that by now some definite information should be available. I might add that I have been seeking this information since last April. Possibly, the Minister of Justice can enlighten the House as to when this information will be supplied. May I say that because the disclosure of certain information would be embarrassing to the government is a darn poor excuse for withholding it from the Canadian public.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of order with respect to a question I put down two months ago, No. 2414, an impor-

#### Order for Return

tant question dealing with the Opportunities for Youth program. I think members of the House are entitled to the information which is being sought.

**Mr. Stackhouse:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order to say that certain questions which I placed on the order paper last February and March have remained unanswered. I can well appreciate that the information, which I am sure is known to the government, might be embarrassing to the Prime Minister and to members of the cabinet if it were disclosed, but it would certainly be useful to the public. I would welcome an answer to these questions at a very early date.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of order respecting questions placed on the order paper. I bring this matter to your attention because of the strange things that are happening between the government and the Cape Breton Development Corporation, including the fact that the senior partner of the law firm representing the miners suddenly found himself on the board of directors of the Cape Breton Development Corporation. My point of order refers specifically to question No. 2581. In order to make it clear that something has gone wrong, I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the terms of that question, which are as follows:

1. How many business enterprises has the Cape Breton Development Corporation invested in since it began operations?

2. (a) How many such businesses are still in operation (b) what is the nature of these operations (c) who are the responsible persons managing them?

3. (a) How many are no longer operating (b) what was the nature of such operations (c) for what reason did they cease operations?

4. Did the Corporation recover its investments?

5. In each instance (a) what was the investment (b) how much of the investment was in the form of (i) grants (ii) loans and, of the amount in loans, how much has been recovered to date?

Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention the fact that the answer provided to this question by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was as follows: "101 business enterprises." That is not an answer in any way, shape or form to question 2581 which has since disappeared from the order paper. I would hate to think that Mr. Tom Kent has enough influence to reach into Ottawa and pluck from the order paper a question with regard to which he is responsible for providing parliament with information.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** How did this question disappear from the order paper? Why is it that the partial answer provided does not in any way conform with an answer given by Tom Kent before the Standing Committee on Regional Development? For six years I have been prodding and trying to get from the government a reasonable settlement, but when questions disappear from the order paper then somebody on the government side has quite a bit of explaining to do, including the placing on the board of directors of the corporation of the senior partner of the law firm employed to fight the case on behalf of the miners. It smells.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!