

Order Paper Questions

● (1502)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Wm. Andres (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 288, 478 and 483. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—ELECTRONIC DEVICES

Question No. 288—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the government and specifically, the Department of External Affairs, aware of electronic listening devices or any other form of surveillance device found in the Embassy of Poland in Ottawa?

2. Did the government receive any representations on the matter from Polish authorities and, if so, from whom and on what date?

3. Is the government aware as to who installed the devices and, if so, what is the identity of the person or persons?

4. Has the government or anyone acting on its behalf, placed listening devices in a foreign Embassy or Consulate in Canada?

5. Does the government possess evidence that such devices were placed by other foreign powers in embassies and, if so, what is their identity along with dates, any incidents and the embassies involved?

Mr. Louis Duclos (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1, 3, 4 and 5. The Canadian government has traditionally refused to comment on such questions, on grounds of national security.

2. No.

CBC—EMPLOYEES

Question No. 478—**Mr. Roy (Laval):**

1. Does CBC have a policy regarding employees who are prosecuted following verbal or written comments and, if so, what is it?

2. During the past ten years, have any employees been prosecuted and, if so (a) how many (b) what amount did CBC spend for their defence, if any?

3. For the same years, were any employees found guilty and, if so (a) how many (b) what was the amount of the settlement, including out of court settlements?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. The CBC has no policy in this regard; however, individual cases are dealt with upon their merits and in accordance with the best interests of the corporation.

2. (a) Twenty.

(b) In all cases the employees were named as co-defendants of the CBC and the same counsel was retained to defend both the employees and the corporation. Since, in such cases, legal expenses are combined, it is impossible to determine how much the corporation has spent exclusively on employees' defence. However, in the context of one of these cases, that is still before the courts, one employee was named in a motion

[Mr. Blais.]

for contempt and the corporation was not named. The amount spent by the CBC in the defence of that employee in the motion for contempt is determinable and it was \$6,207.93.

3. In matters finally determined, no employees were held responsible or found guilty. As for out of court settlements, in one case, while no finding was made by a court, the CBC settled out of court on behalf of itself and the employee involved for \$1,000 damages and \$450 costs. In respect of the motion noted in answer to question 2(b) the employee was found guilty of contempt and the corporation covered \$3,368.09 in satisfaction of court costs.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—LAWYERS IN VICTORIA

Question No. 483—**Mr. McKinnon:**

What were the names and addresses of all lawyers and law firms in the Constituency of Victoria who performed services for the Farm Credit Corporation during 1977 and, in each case, what was the total amount paid?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Farm Credit Corporation advises:

Cecil Branson,
Sullivan, Smith & Bigelow,
505-645 Fort Street,
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1G2.

Fees paid to lawyers used in the constituency of Victoria, British Columbia by Farm Credit Corporation are paid as follows:

(i) by the borrowers upon their direction out of the proceeds of the mortgage loans in which case Farm Credit Corporation does not maintain records of amounts so paid;

(ii) by Farm Credit Corporation on mortgage proceedings—Nil.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. STEVENS—CONDITIONS RESPECTING ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I gave you notice several days ago.

You will recall, sir, that my question of privilege arose from a certain declaration that I was asked to sign on November 23 should I wish to gain access to a lock-up dealing with the 100th Annual Report of the Auditor General to this House. In my notice to you, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that my privilege as a member of parliament and my ability to function as such