

### Questions

Both sets of proposals were considered in some detail in the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK) which was submitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations on September 14, 1970 for consideration by the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

On the question of unification, the report expressed the belief of the Commission that, while there has been no substantial change in the position of the Republic of Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea), the views of both have been further clarified and defined by recent statements. The Report noted that both sides continued to adhere to their fixed positions and that there would appear to be little possibility in the foreseeable future that these positions would be varied. Nevertheless, the Commission declared it would remain receptive to any proposal which would permit it to fulfil a more effective function in respect of unification. It also pointed out that, while the Government of the Republic of Korea has repeatedly affirmed its adherence to the objectives of the United Nations, North Korea continues to deny the competence of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question and continues to challenge the role of the Commission in carrying out its mandate. In the Assembly debate on the Korean question this autumn, Canada co-sponsored and voted in favour of a resolution extending the life and mandate of UNCURK. This resolution received the support of a majority of the members.

### NATIONAL SECURITY—FACILITIES FOR HOUSING ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL DURING RECENT CRISIS

#### Question No. 364—Mr. Coates:

Were additional facilities leased by the federal government for the housing of Armed Forces and RCMP personnel as a result of the request for Armed Forces personnel by the Government of the Province of Quebec and the decision by the federal government to use additional RCMP in the Province of Quebec and, if so (a) from whom were such facilities leased (b) for what period of time (c) at what cost?

**Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of National Defence and the Department of the Solicitor General as follows: No additional facilities were leased for housing Canadian Armed Forces' personnel. Canadian Forces' Bases were used to support the influx of troops and a number of armouries were opened or temporarily taken over to house Regular Force personnel. In a few instances temporary duty was authorized for lodging and meals in areas where no service facilities were available. No additional facilities were leased for housing Royal Canadian Mounted Police personnel.

### UNITED STATES NAVIGATION REGULATIONS

#### Question No. 397—Mr. Rowland:

1. Do American navigation regulations, as applied to the American locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, prevent the vessels of any of Canada's trading partners from entering any of Canada's Great Lakes ports and, if so (a) which ports (b) the vessels of which nations are affected?

[Mr. Sharp.]

2. If the movement of the vessels of some of Canada's trading partners in the Great Lakes are restricted by American navigation regulations, has the Canadian Government made representations to the Government of the United States in this regard?

3. What was the nature of the representations?

4. What was the nature of the response of the Government of the United States to the representations?

**Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** In so far as the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority is concerned: 1. The U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (specifically Section 207.441 of Title 33) covering security regulations for the St. Marys Falls Canal and Locks prohibits passage of "vessels of the Sino-Soviet block countries" through the Soo Locks. This would appear to prevent passages of vessels from these countries via United States waters to all Canadian ports on Lake Superior.

2. No. The issue has not yet arisen inasmuch as no Soviet vessels have ever applied to proceed past Sarnia.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

DR. OLIVE ROBERTSON

#### Question No. 418—Mr. Robinson:

Has Dr. Olive Robertson been refused entry to Canada and, if so, for what reason?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** The Department of Manpower and Immigration has been unable to locate any record of an application for entry to Canada having been submitted by a Dr. Olive Robertson.

### PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

#### Question No. 424—Mr. McCleave:

1. Has the Public Service Commission delegated its employment responsibilities in the past three years to officers of various departments in (a) promotional fields (b) non-promotional fields?

2. In what areas are departments given the authority to make appointments from the open market?

3. If the answer to Part 1(a) or 1(b) is in the affirmative, what was the rationale for such a decision?

4. Has an estimate been made as to the added cost, if any, of such delegation in terms of advertising, travel of examining boards, travel of candidates, and time taken up of departmental people involved in such decisions?

5. What will be the impact of such delegation on the career prospects of public servants.

[Translation]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: (a) Yes. (b) Yes.

2. Subject to the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act and to a requirement to obtain referrals from Canada Manpower Centres, most of the major departments and agencies have been given authority to make appointments from the open market in: (a) all groups in the Administrative Support Category. (b) all