

Orders for Return

National Parks (by Province)	More Money Spent	Less Money Spent
Ontario		
Georgian Bay Islands		\$387,838
Point Pelee	1,121,032	
Pukaskwa		187,039
Manitoba		
Riding Mountain	1,674,070	
Saskatchewan		
Prince Albert	1,242,823	
Alberta		
Banff	4,130,128	
Elk Island	542,300	
Jasper	4,027,980	
Waterton Lakes	1,039,349	
Wood Buffalo	2,938,357	
British Columbia		
Pacific Rim	1,507,732	
Kootenay	1,141,656	
Revelstoke-Glacier	1,908,872	
Yoho	1,778,235	
Northwest Territories		
Nahanni		12,000

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 23—**Mr. Coates:**

Between September 1 and October 30, 1972, were government aircraft used by individuals other than the Prime Minister and Members of the Cabinet and, if so, in each instance (a) under whose authority was the aircraft in question released (b) what was the purpose of the flight (c) what was the destination of the flight (d) what were the names of the individuals on the flight (e) were all employees of the Government of Canada and, if not, what was the reason for their being on the flight in question?

Return tabled.

FOOD IMPORTS 1970-71

Question No. 66—**Mr. Wise:**

What food products, both raw or processed, were imported into Canada in the years 1970 and 1971 and what was the volume of each?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—EXPENDITURES FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTING SERVICES

Question No. 108—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. What was the total amount of money spent in each of the fiscal year 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72 by the Public Service Commission on contracts to outside persons and organizations for research, development and other consulting services?

[Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo).]

2. What are the names and addresses of these outside persons and organizations and what amounts of money were involved in each contract?

3. What was the purpose of each contract and title of each report submitted?

4. What are the names and addresses of outside persons and organizations who were awarded contracts for research, development and other consulting services in the current fiscal year, what are the amounts of money involved in each case and what is the purpose of each contract?

Return tabled.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of asking questions is to get information, and it seems impossible to get any information concerning Wheat Board operations. Question No. 51, dated January 4, is as follows:

• (1410)

As of (a) July 31, 1972 (b) December 31, 1972, what were the estimates by the Wheat Board of the number of bushels of wheat of grades available for export under the several agreements with Mainland China and the U.S.S.R. in storage (i) on farms (ii) in elevators of all kinds?

The answer to that question is available to the minister and has been available for the last four weeks. There is also question No. 55 which concerns farmers all over western Canada. It is dated January 4, and reads as follows:

1. What was the total amount paid for demurrage by the Wheat Board in 1972 for ships which were held up in Vancouver Harbour awaiting wheat cargoes?

2. Is the Wheat Board to receive payment of said amount from the government of Canada or, if not, is it to be considered as a marketing expense which will come out of the farmer producers?

Both of those questions should have been answered long ago. The minister has the information and simply is not placing it before the House because it will be embarrassing. I ask that he give the answers to these questions at the next opportunity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the answers, embarrassing or not, will be available on Wednesday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I asked for the minister to give his assurance, not some subaltern.

Mr. Speaker: The minister rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary has indicated that these answers are likely to be presented on Wednesday; in fact, I dealt with them in my office a few days ago. My question of privilege relates to two things. First, the right hon. gentleman is suggesting that some of the information with regard to these questions was available to me for a certain period of time. The first time I saw that information was when I signed the answers to the questions in my office on Thursday or Friday. Second, I must also say that I object to the right hon. gentleman's suggestion that there is some reason for embarrassment or other purpose or motive in connection with the failure to bring the questions forward. I think that is a breach of