

*Order Paper Questions*

thorough review of historical commercial sampling data and a variety of other biological studies.

- (4) (a) 1981 quotas for seals to be taken in Canadian waters were as follows:

Harp seals—	170,000
Hooded seals	15,000

- (b) (i) The Norwegian allocation of harp seal quotas in 1981 was 22,500. Of the 15,000 hooded seal quota, 6,000 was allocated to both Canada and Norway and the remaining 3,000 was available to vessels of either country.
- (ii) The allocation of harp seals to Norway for 1981 was increased from 20,000 in 1979 and 1980 but remains below the 35,000 in 1977 and 1978. Hooded seal allocations to Norway have remained constant over the last five years.

## CANADIAN FILM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—CHAIRMAN

Question No. 2,455—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. (a) On what date was the answer to question No. 1,852 transmitted to the government by the Canadian Film Development Corporation (b) was there a delay between receipt of the answer by the government and tabling of the answer in the House and, if so, for what reason?

2. Did Mr. Michel Vennat, chairman of the Canadian Film Development Corporation, discuss with the Secretary of State and Minister of Communications the effect of section 5 of the Canadian Film Development Corporation Act upon his ability to serve as chairman at the same time as he maintained an interest in a private law firm with clients in the film industry and, if so, on what date?

3. Did the Secretary of State and Minister of Communications receive a legal opinion from the Department of Justice concerning the effect of section 5 of the act upon the eligibility of Mr. Vennat to serve as chairman and, if so, on what date?

4. Did the minister inform Mr. Vennat, following advice from the Department of Justice, that he was satisfied that Mr. Vennat was not in conflict with section 5 of the act and, if so, on what date?

5. Since his appointment, has the present chairman of the corporation withdrawn from participating in decisions relating to clients of his law firm and, if so (a) on how many occasions (b) were the clients (i) successful (ii) unsuccessful in their applications for assistance?

**Hon. Francis Fox (Secretary of State and Minister of Communications):** 1. Crown corporations do not answer parliamentary questions. Ministers, who are members of Parliament, answer such questions and take full responsibility for such answers.

2, 3 and 4. Mr. Michel Vennat disclosed to the previous secretary of state his situation as member of the board of the Canadian Film Development Corporation and as partner of the law firm of Stikeman, Elliot, Tanaki, Mercier and Robb. During the term of office of the previous government, Mr. Vennat requested and received, on an informal basis, an opinion from legal counsel in the Privy Council Office. The opinion received was to the effect that he was not precluded from being a member and chairman of the board of the Canadian Film Development Corporation by the provisions of section 5 of the Canadian Film Development Corporation Act. The previous secretary of state was obviously satisfied that there

was no conflict of interest in the case of Mr. Vennat. Mr. Vennat disclosed the above information to the present Secretary of State and Minister of Communications in the spring of 1980. The minister has not received a formal opinion from the Department of Justice. In view of the importance of this question for both candidates and the government, in the case of future appointments to this position, the minister has asked officials of the Department of Communications to obtain a formal legal opinion. In the meantime, the provisions of section 5 will be rigidly interpreted and applied to future appointees.

5. Mr. Vennat's term as a member of the board has now expired. I am informed by the Canadian Film Development Corporation as follows: while chairman of the board of the Canadian Film Development Corporation, Mr. Vennat did not take part in the decisions relating to clients of the above-mentioned law firm in their dealings with the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

(a) and (b) Canadian Film Development Corporation records and procedures are not organized in such a way as to provide the information requested.

## DND—USE OF DOGS IN RADIATION RESEARCH

Question No. 2,507—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Does the Department of National Defence conduct experiments subjecting dogs to radiation and, if so (a) for how long will a dog survive from the time of radiation (b) what is the radiation dose (c) what symptoms will the dogs have?

2. Did the military perform similar experiments on cats in the 1950s and, if so, for what reason are the experiments being duplicated?

3. Will meaningful results be obtained by destroying fewer than 40 dogs?

4. Will there be follow-up experiments?

**Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1. The Department of National Defence has not conducted experiments where dogs are subjected to ionizing radiation. However, the department has issued a notice in the Supply & Services Canada, Research and Development Bulletin of its intention to contract for a study on radiation-induced nausea and vomiting using rats and dogs. Past medical research elsewhere has established that only the canine species has a sensitivity to radiation which approaches that of man, and the dogs' ability to vomit makes it an ideal test animal to be used in the proposed study which includes the testing of possible antidotes.

(a), (b) and (c) The exact detail of the study is presently awaiting proposals by the contractor, who has not been selected as yet. However, laboratory dogs would be used in the experiment in accordance with the Guide to the Care and Use of Experimental Animals prepared by the Canadian Council on Animal Care. The experiments would also be reviewed and monitored by an animal care committee to ensure the humane treatment of the dogs.

2. No. No reference to studies where the department has exposed cats to ionizing radiations has been found.

3. It should be possible for the contractor to obtain meaningful results using 40 dogs or less.