

*Order Paper Questions*

4. It is presumed that the Museum was notified of any aircraft sold in their whole state after May 7, 1981.

5. The Museum was not notified about the sale of the Argus. The Argus was sold as scrap metal and not in their whole state because of DND policy prohibiting the sale of combatant type aircraft, including the Argus, to private individuals or organizations.

VIA RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE

Question No. 4,378—**Mr. Blenkarn:**

Is the cost of running passenger service by VIA Quebec four times as expensive per passenger carried as the cost of carrying passengers in that area of the VIA service run by VIA Ontario and, if so, for what reason?

**Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** The management of VIA Rail Canada Inc., advises as follows: No.

MORTGAGE PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PROJECT

Question No. 4,380—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Was Bailey and Rose, a computer consulting firm, given public funds to hire computer consultants on the Mortgage Portfolio Management System project and, if so (a) for what reason (b) for what reason did the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation not manage the project and do the hiring?

2. What amount has been spent on this project to date and over what period of time was it spent?

3. Is the project about to be started up once more and, if so (a) what amount is going to be committed this time (b) who will be responsible for managing the project?

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works):** I am informed by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows:

1. No. (a) and (b) N/A

2. Over the past four years \$18 million has been expended on this initiative.

3. CMHC's systems development initiatives are under review in order to ensure that the Corporation's systems objectives are attained in the most cost-effective manner. Decisions on 3 (a) and (b) will be taken subsequent to this review.

MR. DONALD MARSHALL

Question No. 4,383—**Mr. Crosby:**

1. Did the Minister of Justice advise the Attorney General of Nova Scotia by telex and confirmed by letter respecting the course of conduct he intended to follow in the case of Mr. Donald Marshall on June 8, 9 or 10, 1982 or thereabouts as reported in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* and, if so, what was the content of the telex and letter?

2. Was there correspondence or other communications between the Minister and the Attorney General concerning the case of Mr. Marshall between June 1 and June 16, 1982 and, if so, what was the purpose of that correspondence?

3. Did the Minister at any time in 1982 meet with and discuss with the Attorney General the case of Mr. Marshall and, if so, what was the result of the discussion?

4. Did the Minister telephone or otherwise contact the Attorney General between 3.00 p.m. EDT on June 15, 1982 and 2.00 p.m. EDT on June 16, 1982, concerning the case of Mr. Marshall and, if so, what was the result of the contact?

5. (a) At what exact time was the document dated June 16, 1982 referring the case of Mr. Marshall to the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia (i) prepared (ii) signed by the Minister (b) who witnessed the signing and who prepared the document?

6. (a) At what exact time was the letter dated June 16, 1982 to the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia respecting the case of Mr. Marshall (i) prepared (ii) signed (b) who witnessed the signing and who prepared the letter?

7. Did the Minister know on June 15, 1982 at approximately 2.30 p.m. that he was referring the case of Mr. Marshall to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia and, if not, for what reason did he take this action immediately thereafter?

8. Did the Minister inform the Member of Parliament for Cape Breton-The Sydneys that he was referring the case of Mr. Marshall to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia and, if so, exactly when did he inform him?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** 1. No.

2. Yes. The purpose of this correspondence was to determine the best means of dealing with Mr. Marshall's petition for the exercise of Executive Clemency or the Mercy of the Crown.

3. No.

4. Late in the afternoon of June 15, 1982, D. Rutherford, Q.C., Assistant Deputy Attorney General (Criminal Law), of the Department of Justice attempted without success to reach Gordon Gale, Q.C., Director of Criminal Law in the Department of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia. He communicated with Mr. Gale's office the next morning, leaving a detailed message outlining a proposal to be put before the Minister of Justice later that morning, for a reference of the Marshall case to the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

5. (a) The document dated June 16, 1982, referring the case of Mr. Marshall to the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, was prepared in the late afternoon of June 15, 1982 and presented to the Minister for signature on the morning of June 16, 1982.

(b) Mr. Rutherford prepared the document which was submitted to the Minister on June 16, 1982 by Mr. Jacques Demers, a special adviser to the Minister. The Minister's signature was not witnessed.

6. (a) The letter dated June 16, 1982 to the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, respecting the case of Mr. Marshall, was prepared and signed during the morning of June 16, 1982.

(b) Mr. Rutherford prepared the letter which was submitted to the Minister by Mr. Demers. The Minister's signature was not witnessed.

7. At approximately 2.30 p.m. on June 15, 1982, the Minister was still considering the matter and was awaiting further advice from his officials. The Minister explained these reasons in the House on June 22, 1982.

8. The Minister discussed the Marshall case in a very general fashion with the Member of Parliament for Cape Breton-The Sydneys on June 15, 1982 but did not inform him of the decision to refer the case to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia prior to announcing this decision in the House of Commons on June 16, 1982.