

Order Paper Questions

the Nova, Sunlife and Cidadel Theatre developments to the west, 102 Avenue to the north and 97th Street to the east.

2. The Canada Place site was acquired by way of a land exchange involving the Government of Canada, the Province of Alberta and the City of Edmonton.

On March 31, 1983 a tripartite agreement was executed whereby Public Works Canada agreed to convey the former Prince of Wales and Ortona Armouries valued at \$8,800,000 and \$1,500,000 respectively, the former Strathcona Post Office valued at \$400,000 and a vacant industrial zoned property at 170 Street and 118 Avenue valued at \$2,500,000 to the City of Edmonton along with the proceeds (\$20,500,000) received from the sale of the Federal Building to the Province of Alberta in exchange for the Canada Place site. The total value of the site was \$33,700,000.

3. On March 17, 1983, Treasury Board gave approval in principle to proceed with the Canada Place project by means of a lease-purchase arrangement with a private developer. In doing so, the Government will be leasing the site to a developer on a long-term basis, and the developer will contract to design, construct and finance a building to be leased back to the Government. The improvements will revert back to the Crown upon the termination of the ground lease.

4. The developer for the "Canada Place" project has not yet been named. The developer will be responsible for assembling a project team which will include consulting engineers and architects.

5. The preparation of working drawings and the project construction phase is expected to take approximately 30 months, it is anticipated that this phase may commence as early as October, 1984.

6. The estimated cost of constructing the facility (excluding land costs) is \$89,500,000 (October, 1983 constant dollars).

7. It is anticipated that the Canada Place project will be completed and occupied by mid-1987. The timing will ultimately depend on when a developer is chosen and contracted to undertake the project.

[Translation]

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I ask the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

[English]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in the dying days of this session to lament and regret deeply the Government's attitude with respect to starred questions. I will simply ask the Parliamentary Secretary again if he has any intention of answering my question and if so, could he give me an indication of when that might be.

Mr. Evans: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we intend to answer that question. In fact, half of the answer is now in our hands and

we are attempting to get the other half. At the present moment the half that is in our hands measures almost one half inch thick. It is going to have to be made an Order for Return, Mr. Speaker; it simply cannot be read in this Chamber as a starred question is supposed to be, because it would take literally hours to read. The Hon. Member has obviously misused the starred question provision.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, the misinterpretation placed upon this by the Parliamentary Secretary is somewhat regrettable. The question could have been answered in two different ways, one verbal. The processes of the House are such that all he had to do was to rise in his place and indicate that an Order for Return should be granted. He had three months to do that. The information is in the computer so all he had to do was pull it out. It should not take ten minutes to get the answer.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. The only purpose of a starred question is to have an oral answer given in the House. If the Hon. Member knew it was going to take computer output to answer a question, then why was it put on as a starred question in the first place?

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in six or eight weeks that I have risen to inquire about question No. 1,641 which I asked on November 20, 1981, over three years ago. In each case the Parliamentary Secretary has said that the answer is coming, it will be available forthwith, or that he will attempt to do what he can, but obviously nothing has been done. The question is very simple: it asks whether the directors of the CNR get free passes on Air Canada. A yes or no answer would have been satisfactory. The answer really is that they probably do but they do not want to disclose it. They cannot tell why and they refuse to admit that this is an abuse—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has the answer to his question. The Chair wonders why he had it on the Order Paper. Would the Parliamentary Secretary care to comment?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, again I will indicate that I will try to get an answer for the Hon. Member. If we look at the Standing Orders and at Beauchesne's with regard to Questions on the Order Paper it will be seen that question should not be put on the Order Paper where the answer is available in a public form elsewhere. I suggest that the answers to the questions that Hon. Members are putting on the Order Paper are available elsewhere. Members should not be taking up space on the Order Paper or the time of Parliament to ask questions when they can obtain the answers elsewhere.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the last statement of the Parliamentary Secretary should go unchallenged. The Parliamentary Secretary is only a lackey whose job it is to get the answers to questions that Members of Parliament are entitled to ask. He has no right to make the decision on whether or not the answer is available from another source. If he would do his job rather than passing judgment on whether Members of Parliament are properly