

Order Paper Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE—TAKE HOME PAY

Question No. 2,632—Mr. Forrestall:

By rank, for officers and men, what percentage of gross pay to Canadian Armed Forces personnel was actually taken home by CAF personnel in 1963, 1968 and 1972?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): To provide the information as requested, by rank, would entail the expenditure of man hours and dollars which are not available for this purpose. However, the following information may provide the required comparison.

	Officers	Men
	%	%
1963	84	88
1968	77	83
1972	74	79

NOTE: The above statistics represent gross pay less deductions for Income Tax, Pension, Supplementary Death Benefits and Unemployment Insurance.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—MARRIED QUARTERS

Question No. 2,633—Mr. Forrestall:

With respect to deductions for provision of married quarters for Canadian Armed Forces personnel, are there any instances in which the provisions of Queens Regulations and Order 208.51 are not being met and, if so, what are the circumstances?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): There are no known instances where charges for married quarters, in accordance with Article 208.51 of Q.R. & O. are not being applied to quarters occupied by families. On several bases, where the supply of married quarters exceeds the demand for family accommodations single personnel are offered these quarters with the following stipulations: (a) that the quarters will be vacated on 30 days' notice if required for family accommodation; and (b) that the monthly charge will be the full established rate, i.e., the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation appraised shelter charge plus, where applicable, the national average charge of \$21 for utilities.

CBC—ACQUISITION OF RADIO STATIONS

Question No. 2,640—Mr. Neil (Moose Jaw):

What was the price paid by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to acquire the assets of (a) CFRG/CFGR Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan from *Radio Gravelbourg Limitée* (b) CFNS Saskatoon, Saskatchewan from *Radio-Prairies-Nord Limitée*?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: (a) \$40,000; (b) \$55,000.

[Mr. Allmand.]

AVERAGE "PER DIEM" COST PER ANIMAL AT QUARANTINE STATIONS

Question No. 2,641—Mr. Neil (Moose Jaw):

1. In each of the years 1970, 1971 and 1972, what was the average *per diem* cost per animal for feed and care at each of the quarantine stations (a) Saint Pierre (b) Grosse Île (c) Lévis (d) Edmonton?

2. In each of the years 1970, 1971 and 1972, what was the average cost per ton of hay, grain and/or prepared feed consumed at each of the quarantine stations (a) Saint Pierre (b) Grosse Île, (c) Lévis (d) Edmonton?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. (a) St. Pierre, 1970, \$5.32; 1971, \$5.66; 1972, \$5.73. (b) Grosse Île, 1970, \$3.54; 1971, \$3.69; 1972, \$4.69. (c) Lévis, 1970, \$9.44; 1971, \$8.26; 1972, \$7.01. (d) Edmonton, 1970, Not in operation; 1971, Not in operation; 1972, \$9.03.

2. (a) St. Pierre Hay, 1970, \$59.95 per ton; 1971, \$52.30 per ton; 1972, \$52.80 per ton; Prepared Feed 1970, \$81.15 per ton; 1971, \$86.43 per ton; 1972, \$86.75 per ton. (b) Grosse Île Hay, 1970, \$50.00 per ton; 1971, \$50.00 per ton; 1972, \$65.00 per ton; Prepared Feed 1970, \$68.35 per ton; 1971, \$75.85 per ton; 1972, \$82.73 per ton; (c) Lévis Hay, 1970, \$44.00 per ton; 1971, \$44.00 per ton; 1972, \$48.00 per ton; Prepared Feed 1970, \$110.00 per ton; 1971, \$114.00 per ton; 1972, \$110.00 per ton. (d) Edmonton; 1970—1971 Not in operation. Hay, 1972, \$32.00 per ton; Prepared Feed 1972, \$57.60 per ton.

CIDA—LIAISON DIVISION

Question No. 2,643—Mr. Stevens:

1. On what date was the Evaluation and Liaison Division of CIDA created?

2. How many staff are employed within the Evaluation and Liaison Division of CIDA?

3. (a) To whom does the Director of the Division report (b) to whom is the Director responsible?

4. How many capital projects undertaken by CIDA has the Evaluation and Liaison Division examined since the Division was created (a) what were the projects (b) for what reasons was each project selected for examination (c) for each of the projects examined by the Division (i) what information was judged to be relevant to the examination (ii) what was the information examined (iii) under what criteria was each project evaluated (d) for each project evaluated, what was the result, conclusion or recommendation of each evaluation (e) for each project evaluation which produced a recommendation, in which cases the CIDA acted upon the recommendation of the evaluation (f) for each of the projects evaluated, did the evaluation procedure take place within Canada, or on or near the site of the project?

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows. 1. The Evaluation Division of the Policy Branch of CIDA became effectively operational in January of 1973. 2. Staff numbers as of September 1, 1973 were: Director, 1; Evaluation Officers, 3; Stenographers, 2, for a total of 6. In addition, a full-time consultant to the agency on educational programs is attached to the division. 3. (a) The director of the division reports to the acting vice-president, policy branch; (b) The director is responsible to the acting vice-president, policy branch. 4. To date, the division has not examined any capital projects, but has been actively concerned with other areas of CIDA's programming, particularly in the fields of training and technical assistance.