

Questions

of fact, and there is no insinuation whatever in my question. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) is entirely wrong when he insinuates that I have by this question made any insinuation. My question can be answered yes or no. If it is answered "no" there can be no insinuation, because no wrong would have been done. If it is answered "yes" there is condemnation involved. That is all I need to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 30 will stand.

*SS. ROBERT G. CANN

Mr. DUFF:

1. What subsidy was paid to the ss. Robert G. Cann or her owners for the twelve months ending April 30, 1931?

2. What is the amount of subsidy being paid or to be paid to the ss. Constance for the same service, from Canso to Mulgrave and return?

Mr. STEVENS: If it is acceptable to my hon. friend I believe I am in a position to give a verbal answer to the question. If he wishes a complete answer however the question will have to be held over. As to part 1 of the question, my reply would be that no subsidy was paid for the twelve months ending April 30, 1931. For the twelve months ending March 31, 1931, the subsidy was \$27,400. My answer to part 2 of the question is that the amount of subsidy for this year as provided for in the estimates is \$21,920. The steamer Constance is at present temporarily on the job.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to have my question answered fully. I think the Robert G. Cann performed services last year and received a subsidy.

Mr. STEVENS: I have answered that.

Mr. DUFF: I think my hon. friend has not answered. I have asked what the Robert G. Cann received for the twelve months ending April 30, 1931, and the minister has said she did not receive anything.

Mr. STEVENS: No; surely my hon. friend could not have heard me. In answer to part 1, I said that as yet no subsidy has been paid for the year ending April 30, 1931.

Mr. DUFF: But that is not my question.

Mr. STEVENS: However for the twelve months ending March 31, 1931, the subsidy paid was \$27,400. The answer to part 2 of the question is that the subsidy provided in the estimates amounts to \$21,920. The answer to the balance of the question is that the Constance is temporarily on the route.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. DUFF: Is she receiving the same subsidy?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 31 is answered.

ROYAL GRAIN COMMISSION—REPORT

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

After the receipt of the Stamp commission report on grain futures by the government, was such report itself or a copy thereof, including indices, sent to Sir Josiah Stamp in England for his final perusal and identification, approval or signature, before being sent to the printing bureau in Ottawa and subsequently distributed.

Mr. BENNETT:

The proof of the main report with summary of contents, but without the appendices, was sent to London, England, for examination by the chairman as soon as it was printed. The chairman had requested the main report, so that he might see how it looked in print, check the proof and make any further alterations that seemed desirable. The appendices were not sent. They merely had to be reproduced as selected by the chairman and the checking of this work was left to the secretary.

After the report had been sent to England, the charts and documents previously selected by the chairman in New York for appendices were printed. No changes of any kind were made with respect to any chart. When the proof was returned to Ottawa the few changes and corrections—they were merely formal—suggested by the chairman were made, the appendices were attached to the report, and the report tabled.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Mr. SANDERSON:

1. What are the names of the various municipalities (including towns and cities) in the province of Ontario which applied for grants under the Unemployment Relief Act?

2. What grant was received by each municipality, city or town?

3. What was the federal contribution in each case?

4. What was the provincial contribution in each case?

5. What was the municipal contribution in each case?

6. What amounts have been expended and paid by the federal government to each municipality in each case?

7. Were any amounts granted to these various municipalities out of the special fund and for charitable purposes by virtue of the Unemployment Relief Act?