

Contract Awarded to	Purpose of Contract	Amount Committed
	the recruitment of staff for the unit and assist them in implementing it; to advise the ADM, D and C on matters arising out of the reports and works of the D and C task force.	

CROWN ASSETS DISPOSAL CORPORATION

Question No. 344—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. What is the average number of credit notes that the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation (a) issues (b) refuses to issue, in a year?
2. What has happened to files established by the Marketing and Sales Group of the Corporation identifying the number of complaints from customers?

**Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Supply and Services):** 1. (a) and (b) Our records are not kept in such a manner as to provide this information.

2. As per Public Archives' recommendations in their study of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation's filing system, central registry is responsible for opening and retaining files. All head office divisions including the marketing and sales group forward all files and documentation to the central registry for retention and eventual disposal according to the disposal schedule of the Government of Canada.

Question No. 349—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,331 of the Third Session of the 30th Parliament, for what reason was the merchandise sold to Sedburgh School on March 17, 1977 not inspected by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation prior to the sale, since the Corporation's manual requires such inspection?
2. On what date was a refund made to Sedburgh School for the missing diesel engine?
3. If the Corporation was not advised by the purchaser, that upon collection the diesel engine was missing, for what reason was the refund made?
4. Was the refund made in April 1977 when it was authorized in writing by the Corporation in that month and, if not, for what reason?

**Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Supply and Services):** 1. According to a Crown Assets Disposal Corporation procedure, inspection of surplus materials prior to offering for sales is not mandatory.

2. Refund approved and cheque issued on February 28, 1978.

3. Material was left with custodian department for pick up by Sedburgh school; however, they refused to accept material due to its condition. A written complaint was received by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, from Sedburgh school, in October 1977.

4. Preliminary verbal discussions had taken place between Sedburgh school and our sale's division and upon official receipt of the complaint in October, 1977, an investigation was conducted by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation with the custodian department, and as a result the refund was approved.

METHYLMERCURY

Question No. 384—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Were persons from the Pauingassi Indian Reserve tested for methylmercury and, if so, how many and on what dates?

Order Paper Questions

2. Was testing done on persons living on the Reserve prior to 1977 and, if so, what were the results in (a) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975 (g) 1976?

3. Has action been taken on behalf of the persons who have been living with unacceptable levels and, if so, in what way?

**Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** In so far as the Department of National Health and Welfare is concerned:

1. Yes.

Date	Number of People
16/01/74	19
24/06/76	15
16/09/76	10
21/10/76	2
30/06/77	1
02/07/77	1
24/05/78	3
	51 tests

Thirteen individuals have been tested on more than one occasion.

2. (a) No testing.  
(b) No testing.  
(c) No testing.  
(d) No testing.  
(e) A total of 19 tests were performed in 1974, the results are as follows:

1— 6 ppb Mercury in blood	3— 40 ppb Mercury in blood
1—10 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 42 ppb Mercury in blood
1—14 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 45 ppb Mercury in blood
1—22 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 48 ppb Mercury in blood
1—24 ppb Mercury in blood	2— 50 ppb Mercury in blood
1—35 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 57 ppb Mercury in blood
1—36 ppb Mercury in blood	1—123 ppb Mercury in blood
1—37 ppb Mercury in blood	1—151 ppb Mercury in blood

- (f) No testing.  
(g) A total of 27 tests were performed in 1976, the results are as follows:

2— 5 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 31 ppb Mercury in blood
1— 8 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 32 ppb Mercury in blood
1—10 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 35 ppb Mercury in blood
1—12 ppb Mercury in blood	2— 38 ppb Mercury in blood
2—16 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 41 ppb Mercury in blood
1—18 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 47 ppb Mercury in blood
1—25 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 59 ppb Mercury in blood
2—26 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 62 ppb Mercury in blood
1—27 ppb Mercury in blood	1— 94 ppb Mercury in blood
1—29 ppb Mercury in blood	2—132 ppb Mercury in blood
1—30 ppb Mercury in blood	1—161 ppb Mercury in blood

(\* ppb—parts per billion)

3. In accordance with the standard policy of medical services branch of National Health and Welfare, discussions have been held with individuals having levels in the 20-99 parts per billion (ppb) range and those with "at risk" levels (see below) in order that advice might be given regarding modification of intake of the food source containing mercury (in this case, fish).

The two individuals found to be in the "at risk" group (i.e. blood mercury levels greater than 100 ppb) have been advised to undergo a complete clinical examination. One person has been examined on two occasions. The other individual has refused to be examined.