

Questions

Petrie Point by the Royal Canadian Engineers as a "training exercise"?

2. Was consideration and approval given by the Department within the past year to instituting a similar "training exercise" for the Royal Canadian Navy using R.C.N. underwater personnel to remove wrecks in Sydney Harbour and, if not, for what reasons?

3. On what basis did the Department decide (a) that the Petrie Point demolition project was a "suitable" training exercise (b) that the Sydney Harbour job was an "unsuitable" one?

4. Did the Department view the Sydney Harbour project as one where all wrecks and obstructions above and below water mark, would be demolished or did it envisage only removal of those wrecks appearing above water at low tide?

5. In estimating the cost of the proposed Sydney Harbour job, was consideration given to the fact that expenses connected with the operation of an R.C.N. underwater team would have to be met in large part wherever they were carrying on routine training and operations, whether it be at Sydney Harbour, Halifax or elsewhere?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

2. Yes; however, it was not approved as it was understood that private diving companies had tendered bids and it was felt that the Canadian armed forces should not enter into a project which might conflict with local commercial interests. In addition, it was not considered that any valuable or progressive training could be derived from this work.

3. (a) Of several defence structures at Petrie Point only a three storey concrete tower was selected for demolition. This provided an opportunity at a minimal cost for military engineers to practice a demolition technique that would not otherwise have been possible. (b) The evaluation of the project was based on a survey carried out by divers of the maritime command. The hulks were too rotten and dilapidated for refloating techniques and very little explosive demolition work would be involved.

4. Both were considered.

5. Yes.

TRAINING IN UNDERWATER DEMOLITION

Question No. 384—Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):

1. Where do Royal Canadian Navy personnel receive training in underwater demolition and what is the average cost in round figures of training a single R.C.N. diver in such work?

2. Does this training consist of theoretical problems or does it include actual demolition of wrecks and do R.C.N. divers receive continuing training in underwater demolition in Canadian harbours and coastal waters or do they receive "refresher" courses?

29180—101½

3. How often in the past ten years have R.C.N. divers been used to demolish wrecks in Canadian waters and at what locations?

4. Does the Department consider it necessary to restrict R.C.N. underwater personnel to the Halifax area to effectively meet emergency requirements rather than employ them on routine tasks along the Eastern seaboard?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1. Halifax, Nova Scotia, approximately \$600.00.

2. The training involved prepares the diver to carry out the following tasks: (a) sandbar removal and channel widening; (b) demolishing concrete, brick, masonry and wooden structures; (c) ice removal; (d) rock blasting; (e) remove propellers; (f) cut wood, metal or other materials explosively; (g) excavate explosively; and consists of both theoretical and practical problems but does not include the demolition of wrecks by explosives. The diver's continuing training requirement is met through an annual operational commitment with the Department of Transport, DEW line replenishment program.

3. Twice, in 1959, the approaches to Halifax harbour and in 1965, Trois-Rivières harbour. Both incidents were to remove navigational hazards.

4. Yes, this permits the maritime commander to effect more economical control in meeting operational and emergency requirements. Within the operational diving unit there is a mobile element which is available to meet emergency demands along the eastern seaboard and elsewhere.

JURISDICTION OVER WRECK REMOVAL,
SYDNEY HARBOUR

Question No. 385—Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):

Did the Department of Justice receive a request from the Cape Breton Regional Planning Commission for an opinion as to the jurisdiction in which removal of wrecks in Sydney Harbour might fall as between governments and/or departments of government and, if so, has this opinion been rendered and what were its terms?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No.

SALARY INCREASES FOR SEMI-STAFF POSTAL
EMPLOYEES

Question No. 391—Mr. Peddle:

Has the government given consideration to salary increases for postal employees in "semi-staff offices"?