

Questions

5. Tolls and Lockage Charges

	(000's \$)		
	Montreal— Lake Ontario Section (Tolls)	Welland Canal (Charges)	Total Receipts
1959.....	7,105	1,224	8,329
1960.....	7,156	1,327	8,483
1961.....	8,086	1,462	9,548
1962.....	8,914	641	9,555
1963.....	10,730	—	10,730
1964.....	13,545	—	13,545
1965.....	15,481	—	15,481
1966.....	17,282	—	17,282
1967.....	16,356	926	17,282
1968.....	18,141	1,756	19,897
1969.....	15,636	2,502	18,138
1970.....	18,599	3,545	22,144
1971.....	20,041	4,347	24,388
	177,072	17,730	194,802

6. The government has under study the Seaway Authority's financial structure to determine whether its obligations should be changed to be in line with a realistic assessment of anticipated revenues. Although the Seaway Authority has, since 1959, returned over \$115 million to the Federal Government, over and above operation and maintenance costs on the Montreal-Lake Ontario section, it has not been able to meet its total interest liability nor repay any portion of the original cost of construction. As a result of the shortfall in interest payments, the outstanding indebtedness of the Authority has risen to the point where it is no longer reasonable to expect that future toll revenues can meet the obligations of the Authority under its existing financial structure. In 1970, the U.S. Government revised the financial structure of the American counterpart to Canada's Seaway Authority, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, so as to require the Corporation to only cover annual operation and maintenance costs and repay the original capital costs of construction—accrued and future interest obligations were waived. This approach, along with other proposals, such as those contained in the Carr Report, present themselves as possibilities for altering the present system of repayment of the outstanding obligations of the Seaway Authority.

DARTMOUTH PUBLIC WHARF

Question No. 185—Mr. Forrestall:

With respect to the reply to Question No. 127 at page 1277 of *Hansard* dated November 18, 1970 (a) what were the conclusions of the consulting firm's report (b) what recommendations have been received to date by the government from the management of Halifax Harbour (c) what action is contemplated in the immediate future?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: (a) The consulting firm's report was inconclusive as to whether the wharf should be demolished or repaired. (b) Decision on repair or demolition of Dartmouth Pier be deferred until completion of harbour resource study which is underway and expected to be completed by May 31, 1972. In the meantime the scrap metal and unsightly material have been removed from the wharf. (c) See (b).

[Mr. Duquet.]

ASSISTANCE UNDER PRAIRIE GRAIN ADVANCE
PAYMENTS ACT

Question No. 278—Mr. Korchinski:

1. Under the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, how many cash advances were made in the years (a) 1969-70 (b) 1970-71 (c) 1971-72?
2. How many cash advances were declared in default in (a) 1970-71 (b) 1971-72?
3. How many recipients were declared in default as a result of Section 13(c)?
4. How many of those in default have made deliveries according to available quota?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice): 1. (a) 122,080; (b) 51,332; (c) 34,239 to May 8, 1972.

2. (a) 13,000; (b) 13,500.

3. 11,000.

4. The deliveries associated with these cases range over a three year period. The cost in terms of manpower and time to provide an answer to this part of the question is prohibitive. It is estimated by the Canadian Wheat Board that at least three man-hours would be required to examine each producer's delivery records for the three years to determine if every delivery opportunity had been utilized. The total requirement to investigate all defaulted advance payment accounts would exceed thirty thousand man-hours.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT—NOTICE OF DEFECTS IN
VEHICLES

Question No. 304—Mr. Mather:

Has the Department of Transport required that auto makers recall and bear the cost of repairing vehicles with safety related defects and, if so, on what authority?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Under section 8 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Act it is an offence for a manufacturer, distributor or importer to fail to give notice of any defect in the construction, design or functioning of a motor vehicle or its components that affects or is likely to affect the safe operation of the vehicle and of which he is aware. There are no specific requirements under federal law requiring a manufacturer to correct safety defects in vehicles or to bear the cost of such work.

COMPENSATION TO JAMES RICHARD CROSS

Question No. 320—Mr. Godin:

Has the government recognized the anguish and hardships endured by the British diplomat James Richard Cross during his detention by the FLQ and, if so (a) was an amount of money offered to Mr. Cross as compensation (b) is this amount being paid on a monthly basis or was it paid as a lump sum?

Mr. Barnett J. Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): (a) The anguish and the hardship suffered by Mr. Cross at the hands of the FLQ, and the courage with which he endured his terrifying experience, are indeed recognized by the Government of Canada as they are by Canadians. The calm discipline of Mr. Cross and the bravery of his wife and daughter during that