

Order Paper Questions

2. Will the sign-strip be added to all government buildings in the Constituency and, if so, at what cost?

3. (a) Who produces the sign-strips and at what cost per strip (b) what is the labour cost of their addition to existing signs?

4. Are the strips being added to already-existing government signs and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Canada Post Corporation has been adding an additional sign-strip to 15 existing signs in the Constituency of Victoria-Haliburton (Apsley, Omemee, Lindsay, Little Britain, Bobcaygeon, Kinmount, Coboconk, Sunderland, Cannington, Beaverton, Jackson Point, Pefferlaw, Sutton West, Ponty Pool and Woodville). Total cost for the 15 Post Office "Canada" wordmark blades was \$6,750.

2. Yes, Canada wordmark sign-strips are being added to all government buildings which do not comply with the Federal Identity Program (FIP) at a national average cost of approximately \$950 per sign-strip, prices varying with dimension of blade and location and including shipping, handling and installation.

3. (a) The sign-strips are produced by the Department of Supply and Services, Canadian Government Expositions Centre, at a national average cost of approximately \$750 per strip. (b) Approximately \$200 per sign-strip for installation including shipping and handling.

4. The sign-strips are being added to the bottom of existing signs to make them conform with the Federal Identity Program. The strip being added is the Canada wordmark. According to the Federal Identity Program all buildings must be identified in the following manner:

Federal signature (in this case Canada Post);
message (name of building or address);
Canada wordmark.

* * *

[English]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, if question No. 4,397 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 4,397 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

DIAND—OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS

Question No. 4,397—Mr. Shields:

1. Were outside consultants employed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in the fiscal year (a) 1980-81 (b) 1981-82 and, if so, how many and what was the total amount paid?

2. Were any consultants paid more than \$10,000 and, if so, in each case (a) what was his/her name (b) what was the amount paid (c) what services were provided?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Late last week, on Friday, the Parliamentary Secretary filed an answer to question No. 4,203. The question related to loans to employees of Petro-Canada or its subsidiaries. It requested the usual answers and asked what was the name and title of the employee, what loan was made, what date it was made, what was the amount of the loan, what interest rate was being charged and what was the purpose of the loan. The answer I received to that question stated:

Petro-Canada reports as follows:

The requested information is considered to be of a managerial and administrative nature between Petro-Canada and the Corporation's employees and, therefore, cannot be released to the public.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): I know the Ministers can say anything they want in their answers, but I wanted to bring the fact to the Chair's attention that there have been many other answers given to similar questions with respect to similar organizations. This is the first in the number of answers I have received in which the answer has not been "No" to the question: "Have any loans been made?" The answers to former questions were very clear and indicated that information would be given even if it were managerial and administrative in nature.

Now, when we know that the answer is yes, there have been loans made, and we merely want details concerning public money, we receive the answer "No" from the Minister and this half-baked answer from his colleague. I would like to give the Parliamentary Secretary a chance. He and I have discussed the importance of clarity and openness with respect to answers. Would the Parliamentary Secretary undertake to go back to the responsible Minister and obtain an appropriate answer, one which is responsive to the question as all other answers have been responsive to similar questions?

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I will be happy to review that answer with the Minister concerned. I believe he is in the House and has heard this exchange, so it may not be that difficult to consult with him.

Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.