

that Brockville Cable Limited had yet to reply to the commission's representations made as a result of Brockville city council's resolution?

3. If the CRTC does not receive replies to its mail within a reasonable time is it customary to wait five months or more to follow matters up and, if so, for what reason?

4. Will the commission reply to the Brockville city council and, if so, on what date?

Mr. Peter Stollery (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State and Minister of Communications): I am informed by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission that the reply to the above question is as follows:

1. A letter dealing with this matter was received in the commission, December 17, 1979.

(a) The date as typed in the letter was "1979 12 13".

(b) An interim response to this letter was sent to Mr. A. J. Miles, city clerk of Brockville, on January 30, 1980. This letter informed Mr. Miles that the city's resolution had been brought to the attention of Brockville Cable.

2. Mr. Vincent Lee-Chong, an employee of the commission, did receive a telephone inquiry from Mr. Bob Runciman, member of the Brockville city council, re the resolution of the Brockville city council. This inquiry was received in late March 1980.

The answer given was that no reply had yet been received from Brockville Cable regarding the city council's resolution. Brockville Cable was subsequently contacted and questioned about this and other complaints re cable service. Copies of 13 responses to complainants were forwarded by Brockville Cable to the commission in a letter dated April 14, 1980. These responses did not include any concerning Brockville city council. A special letter dated April 24, received by the commission April 27, contained a copy of a response to the Brockville city council resolution. This response was dated April 3, and apparently had been sent directly to Mr. A. J. Miles, city clerk of Brockville. Brockville Cable had been advised in the commission's letter of January 30, that in addition to communicating with the commission, it could get in touch with the complainants directly.

3. It is customary to issue follow-up communications if response to commission mail is not received within reasonable time. In this case this follow-up communication was sent approximately two months after the original CRTC letter to Brockville Cable.

4. The commission has replied to the city of Brockville. In that letter the commission, after outlining earlier inquiries into the matter, undertook for senior staff to visit Brockville, meet Brockville city council representatives and inspect the cable television operations. Further action will depend on the findings of that visit.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CONTRACTS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Question No. 690—Mr. Clarke:

1. For the fiscal year 1978-79, how many contracts were let by the Department of External Affairs for professional services, to persons who at any time

Order Paper Questions

within the past five years, had been employed in indeterminate positions under the Public Service Commission?

2. How many contracts were (a) for less than one year (b) for one to two years (c) over two years?

3. How many contracts were let outside the national capital region?

4. What was the total cost of all such contracts?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Five.

2. (a) Four; (b) one; (c) none.

3. None.

4. \$31,260.69.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—LOSS OF VEHICLES

Question No. 722—Mr. Clarke:

1. With reference to the uninsured losses of more than \$1,000 of vehicles recorded by the Department of External Affairs in footnote number 7 at page 12.62, Volume I of the 1978-79 Public Accounts of Canada, for what reason was the loss of \$21,450 unexplained?

2. Did the department undertake steps to ascertain the whereabouts of the two vehicles and, if so, what were they?

3. Was the thief apprehended?

4. In what locations did the losses occur?

5. Did the department undertake steps to ensure that such losses do not recur and, if so, what were they?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. The descriptive title of the Public Accounts statement in question is considered to be self-explanatory (i.e., losses due to destruction or damage), and no further explanation appears necessary as in accordance with relevant instructions from the Receiver General, the footnote identifies those losses which occurred other than by destruction or damage.

2. The vehicles concerned were utilized by our embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. Their loss due to theft was reported to the civil authorities. The vehicles were a 1972 Landrover and a 1975 Peugeot 504 Sedan.

3. No, the vehicles were taken during time of civil uprising. Local authorities attempted to investigate, however, results were negative.

4. The losses occurred in Beirut, Lebanon.

5. The department always ensures that maximum protection is afforded to all public assets.

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE—PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE—ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICY CONSULTANTS UNDER CONTRACT

Question No. 767—Mr. Shields:

Since August 1, 1978, how many (a) administrative (b) policy consultants were under contract to the Prime Minister's office and Privy Council office and/or any boards, commissions or corporations reporting to the Prime Minister and, in each case, what amount was paid to them?

Mr. D. M. Collenette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Prime Minister and Privy Council offices are concerned: (a) and (b) none.

In so far as the Economic Council of Canada is concerned: