basis the Government has created the problem, and these two estimates must be withdrawn or disallowed.

Now, the Government can, as pointed out by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) introduce a Bill, or perhaps a new set of Supplementary Estimates, for $400 million or whatever it needs, which would probably be more than that. But the way it is now, the Government has created a corporate mess and it cannot now come before the House and ask for advances for the purpose of capitalization of two Crown-owned corporations because those corporations are no longer directly owned by the Crown. Our submission, then, is that these votes are no longer proper. The Government's own action has made them improper.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker: Since this is a very technical matter, I shall have to take this point of order under consideration I wish to thank the Hon. Members for the points they have made.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

STANDING COMMITTEES

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE—PRESENTATION OF FIFTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Madam Speaker, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National defence, I have the honour of tabling the Fifteenth Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, which examined Bill C-130 on behalf of the House.

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS—PRESENTATION OF FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval): Madam Speaker, I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages, the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, concerning a study made of urea formaldehyde foam insulation.

[*Editor's Note: For above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

PETITION

MR. BRADLEY—OPPOSITION TO BILL C-10

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Madam Speaker, it is my duty to present a petition signed by 76 members of the

Congregation of the Selkirk Church of Christ Christian Chapel which is in my constituency of Haldimand-Norfolk, who are very concerned about the provisions of the proposed Non-Profit Corporations Act, Bill C-10. The purpose of this petition is to protest the Government's proposed changes in Bill C-10, which allows a court of law to interfere in the affairs of the Church body. The nature of the petition is to urge the Government to drop the provisions of Bill C-10 which would infringe on the rights and privileges of the Church to take a moral stand on matters concerning membership of that Church body.

The petitioners hope that in your examination of the petition you will find the petition in order, and that you will exercise the discretionary powers vested in the office of the Speaker of the House to allow discussion and referral to committee at the earliest possible time, in order that the sanctity of the Church in Canadian society can be preserved.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 987 and 4,528.

[*Text*]

DEFENCE INDUSTRY PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAM

Question No. 987—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Did the Government undertake a national advertising campaign to publicize the industrial benefits of the F-18 fighter and, if so, what is the planned expenditure for the advertising campaign?

2. Are the full benefits of the $2.91 billion in industrial offsets contingent upon Government assistance to Canadian industry to permit it to re-tool and thereby take advantage of these programs and, if so, will the Defence Industry Productivity (DIP) Program be part of such Government assistance to industry?

3. What effect did the August, 1978 round of cut backs have in the DIP budget for the fiscal year (a) 1978-79 (b) 1979-80?

4. Does the development of high technology projects require several years lead time and, if so, what effect have these cutbacks had in industry's ability to take advantage of the current industrial offset program?

5. With reference to DIP expenditures for the fiscal year ended (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 (d) 1977 (e) 1978 (f) 1979 (g) 1980, what was the total in grants and contributions (i) to industry (ii) when deflated by an appropriate price index?

6. Has the DIP budget for the fiscal year 1980-81 been committed since December of 1979?

7. Did the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce receive applications totalling over $100 million for the development of industrial technology for DIP assistance in the fiscal year 1980-81 and, if so, what effect will the lack of DIP funds have on the $2.91 billion industrial offset program associated with the F-18 fighter?