

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Greenaway: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have delivered petitions in this House before and I was always under the impression that you had to give the very basic facts, not a lot of detail. These petitions are very detailed. Indeed, they are arguments. I ask you to consider that.

Mr. Speaker: There has been some discussion in the Chamber with respect to the extent to which remarks are made at the time of presenting petitions. I think Hon. Members who have petitions to present will take into account the sensibility of other Members and keep their remarks short.

• (1110)

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, on behalf of residents of a variety of communities in Newfoundland, to present a petition to the House of Commons. These petitioners are asking the Government to reconsider its plans to change the Patent Act which they say will severely restrict the ability of average Canadians to buy necessary prescription drugs and suggest that this will result in higher costs to provincial government drug plans. For a variety of other reasons, which I will not take the time to read, they ask the Government to consider not proceeding further with this piece of legislation.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and privilege to present three petitions from an organization called Senior Power, members of which reside in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and such villages as Milestone, Blaine Lake, Esterhazy and Unity in the Province of Saskatchewan. The petitioners humbly pray and petition Parliament to reject proposals to amend the Patent Act which they believe will increase the price of prescription drugs for all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 27, 34 and 38.

[Text]

NATIONAL FLAG OF CANADA MANUFACTURING STANDARDS
ACT

Question No. 27—**Mr. McKinnon:**

Is progress being made to bring into effect the provisions of the National Flag of Canada Manufacturing Standards Act, Chapter 28, Statutes of Canada, 1984 and, if so, when will this occur?

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of Supply and Services): Yes. Progress is being made to revise the existing standard

CAN/CGSB-98.1-M79 as required under the Act and the following is the progress to date.

The Canadian General Standards Board (CGSB), lacking any regulatory authority, is not in a position to bring into effect all the provisions of the cited Act. At the present time it can only proceed with the development of a new National Standard of Canada to reflect current manufacturing techniques and materials.

Since the passage of the National Flag of Canada Manufacturing Standards Act, the representative CGSB Standards Committee has been reactivated to develop a new edition of the existing national standard on the national flag using the consensus process.

Outdoor life tests were conducted in the National Capital Region during the whole of a winter, but the results were not accepted by the committee. At the committee's request, arrangements were made with a commercial laboratory to supervise a more conclusive test program.

The text program has been delayed, first by physical difficulties at the test site, and second by suppliers' repeated postponements in providing specimen flags for testing. The first difficulty has now been overcome, and the second will be avoided by purchasing specimen flags in the market-place. The actual life tests, of course, cannot satisfactorily be shortened.

It is expected that a final standard for outdoor long-term flags will be available by the end of 1987, and that standards for other uses (e.g. indoor) will be available sooner.

STANDARDS COUNCIL OF CANADA

Question No. 34—**Mr. Caccia:**

1. Is the International Standardization Branch of the Standards Council of Canada being moved from Mississauga to Ottawa and, if so, for what reason?
2. (a) How many persons will be asked to relocate to Ottawa (b) what will be the estimated cost, in severance pay or other forms, to reimburse those persons who refuse to relocate?
3. What will be the estimated cost of operation in the first year, and how does this compare with the annual costs of operation for the last three fiscal years in Mississauga?
4. What criteria were used to determine if the International Standardization Branch could operate as effectively in Ottawa as in Mississauga, and how will the failure or success of this move be monitored in the future?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I am advised by the Standards Council of Canada as follows:

1. Yes. Reviews have determined that significant efficiencies can be realized as a result of consolidation of operations.
2. (a) Nineteen. (b) \$50,000.
3. Cost of operations—International Standards Branch

1987-88	\$ 2,764,000	estimated
1986-87	3,222,500	forecast