

Auditor General

3. Who are the directors and chief executive officers of Abitibi Paper Co. Ltd. and what is the address of each?

4. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

5. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Return tabled.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an inquiry about question No. 827 which was placed on the Order Paper on January 12 and concerns the Canada Grains Council. I would ask whether inquiries could be made about this question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will inquire in that regard. With regard to the earlier submission, may I point out that over 75 per cent of the questions asked this session have already been answered, including 57 today.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, with regard to what the House Leader has just said, I should like to point out that questions 162 to 172 standing in my name have been on the Order Paper since the beginning of the session on October 23. This is almost a period of six months. The questions pertain to a very important matter, namely, the degree of involvement of foreign firms in business activities in this country. At various times in the past month I have been promised that the answers would be forthcoming, and I should like the House Leader to give me some assurance as to when the answers can be expected.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, considering the imprecision in the way that the questions have been drawn obtaining replies has taken a great deal of time. It is difficult to inquire into the control of over 800 firms in Canada. However, I will get the replies as quickly as I can.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**AUDITOR GENERAL****STATEMENTS BY GOVERNMENT MEMBERS
CONCERNING ACTIVITIES**

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, pursuant to Standing Order 26, to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the unprecedented challenge to the Auditor General, a servant of this House and

[Mr. Burton.]

Parliament, involved in the question asked by the hon. member for Sarnia of the President of the Privy Council as recorded in *Hansard* on March 25, and the subsequent statement made outside the House by the President of the Privy Council, which are critical of the Auditor General in the performance of his duty and which followed almost immediately on the tabling in this House by the Minister of Finance of the Auditor General's report for 1968-69, volume I. In particular, a statement by the President of the Privy Council suggests that he and certain of his colleagues have tried, condemned and found guilty the Auditor General by star chamber tactics that are repugnant to Canadians.

The urgency of the situation and of debate lies in the fact that this challenge to the office of the Auditor General must impair his usefulness and encourage government officials to disregard his views, and this House provides the only forum to discuss the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River has proposed the adjournment of the House to discuss what the hon. member describes as "the unprecedented challenge to the Auditor General" by the government.

The Chair agrees with the hon. member that the relations between the Auditor General and the government and Parliament constitute a very serious and important matter indeed. The question is not whether this situation should be debated by hon. members in due course, but whether this House should be adjourned for the purpose of considering the matter later today.

As the hon. member well knows, in making its decision the Chair is required by the Standing Orders to take into account the possibility that the matter may be discussed in the House by other means at an early date. There are long-standing precedents to indicate that an immediately pending or continuing budget debate is deemed to provide the type of opportunity envisioned by the Standing Order. The current budget debate has not yet been completed and there are still at the disposal of hon. members two of the six days provided by the rules. I understood the President of the Privy Council to indicate earlier this afternoon that these days would be called on Wednesday and Thursday of this week, at which time the situation alluded to by the hon. member for Peace River might well be considered by the House.

In the circumstances, I must conclude that the hon. member's proposed motion cannot be put to the House at this time under the terms of Standing Order 26.