

7. At December 31, 1976 Canadian National Railways owed \$4,442,995 representing December items. This amount was paid in January, 1977.

8. Year ended December 31, 1974, \$84,672,803; Year ended December 31, 1975, \$93,567,159; Year ended December 31, 1976, \$109,308,650.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AUTHORITY

Question No. 2,069—**Mr. Laprise:**

In (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what interest was charged to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and what amount (i) has been paid (ii) is outstanding?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows:

| | TOTAL INTEREST | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Charged | Paid | Outstanding |
| (a) Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1974 (12 Mos.) | \$40,899,644 | \$25,599,644 | \$15,300,000 |
| (b) Jan. 1/75-Mar. 31/76 (15 Mos.)* | 54,428,110 | 24,828,110 | 29,600,000 |
| (c) Apr. 1/76-Mar. 31/77 (12 Mos.) | 46,175,559 | 21,175,559 | 25,000,000 |

*By Order-in-Council P.C. 1975-799, dated April 8, 1975, the financial year of The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority was changed from the calendar year to the fiscal year. This resulted in a fifteen month accounting period from January 1, 1975, to March 31, 1976 and is reflected in the above figures.

IMPORT/EXPORT CONTAINER TRAFFIC MOVING VIA UNITED STATES PORTS

Question No. 2,086—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What action has the government taken over the past years to stop the flow of containers with Canadian import/export goods via US ports, in order to help maritime and St. Lawrence ports to retain this traffic?
2. How many more longshoremen would be employed in Canadian ports if such traffic would have moved via Canadian ports?
3. Will the government take any action, in view of the recent statement made by the chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, to investigate the introduction of legislation in the US Congress which will force all carriers to file rates via Canadian ports?
4. Will the government require the American steamship lines to file their rates with the Canadian Transport Commission?
5. Will the government require the Canadian Transport Commission to scrutinize the rates filed to ascertain whether or not they are compensatory?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. The government has developed competitive container facilities at major maritime and St. Lawrence ports and contacts users of United States ports to influence utilization of Canadian ports.

2. Due to the difficulty in accurately determining Canadian traffic through United States ports and the various productivity levels for different types of cargo at each port, the net effect on manpower requirements of routing all Canadian traffic through Canadian ports cannot be measured.

3. The government will take whatever action it considers necessary after examining the United States legislation.

Order Paper Questions

4. The government will consider what action would be appropriate after examining the United States legislation.

5. See answer to 4 above.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PROTECTION AND POLICING OF PUBLIC PROPERTY

Question No. 2,166—**Mr. Stevens:**

As of December 31 (a) 1968 (b) 1976, what was the number of federal employees engaged in the protection and policing of public property?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): (a) 174; (b) 773.

NOTE: There has been an increase of 599 members so employed during the period involved. This growth is almost exclusively attributable to the creation, and expansion within the Airport Policing Branch, which increased from 66 members in 1968 to 646 members as of December 31, 1976, a total of 580 members.

REVENUE FROM COMPANIES OPERATING TERMINALS USED BY MANCHESTER LINES, CAST GROUP AND CP SHIPS

Question No. 2,217—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. For (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what was the total revenue collected by the National Harbours Board from companies operating the terminal used by (i) Manchester Lines at Montreal (ii) the CAST Group at Montreal (iii) CP ships at Quebec City?
2. In each case, since 1970, was paving or repaving undertaken and, if so, is it fully and directly being recovered from the operator and, if not, what government agency paid for the paving or repaving?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1.

| | | (i) | (ii) | (iii) |
|-----|------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| (a) | 1974 | \$826,631 | \$ 849,350 | \$802,655 |
| (b) | 1975 | 647,487 | 876,178 | 519,081 |
| (c) | 1976 | 708,375 | 1,007,755 | 752,773 |

2. Original paving costs were included in the completed construction costs which are recoverable through terminal revenues, and no subsequent paving costs have been incurred.

OCTOBER 1970 CRISIS

Question No. 2,220—**Mr. Matte:**

1. During the October 1970 crisis, were the families and residences of (a) Senators (b) (i) MPs (ii) MLAs (c) other citizens put under the surveillance of the Army and, if so, how many in each case?
2. Were persons desirous of obtaining such surveillance required to submit a request to a committee and, if so, how many were on the committee?