Questions

Comparison of Cost Estimates for Columbia River Treaty Projects
5½% interest assumed for all estimates

Estimates prepared for:	International Joint Commission		Canadian Negotiators Negotiators Work Group	Northern Affairs and National Resources
Estimates prepared by:	I.C.R.E.B.			Montreal Engineering Co.
Date prepared:	1956-58		1960[1]	1961[1]
	$		$	$
High Arrow lakes	68,016,000		71,790,000	81,200,000
Duncan lake	25,616,000		25,616,000	28,700,000
Mica storage	—	(2)	247,193,000	288,100,000(3)
Total Investment Costs	—		344,599,000	398,000,000

(1)These estimates adopted the basic relocation and other reservoir costs established by the I.C.R.E.B. for the international joint commission.

(2)The I.C.R.E.B. did not prepare an estimate for the cost of Mica prior to the installation of generators.

(3)This estimate could be reduced to $253,600,000 by deferring the cost of items required for the generation of energy at this project.

*CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION NO. 2650-1961

Question No. 902—**Mr. Rinfret:**

1. Did the civil service commission advertise a competition under the heading "Careers for university graduates" and quote a competition number 2650-1961, and, if so, (a) how many candidates came from Laval, Montreal, and Sherbrooke universities (b) how many candidates were successful on all papers (c) how many did the civil service commission employ?

2. Were graduates with a Bachelor of Arts degree from these universities allowed to compete and, if so (a) how many candidates came directly from "classical colleges" and (b) how many have been employed by the civil service?

Mr. Halpenny: 1. The civil service commission did conduct a competition under the heading "Careers for university graduates" under competition No. 61-2650.

(a) One hundred and forty three candidates.

(b) Eighteen were successful on all papers and all were offered employment.

(c) Six accepted the offer and were employed.

2. Yes.

(a) and (b) No record was kept of those who came directly from classical colleges.

(Translation):

LAPRAIRIE COUNTY, QUE.—COMPENSATION FOR EXPROPRIATED LAND

Question No. 913—**Mr. Boucher:**

How many owners of land or buildings in the county of Laprairie subjected to expropriations by the St. Lawrence seaway authority, have not yet been compensated by the said authority?

Mr. McBain: The St. Lawrence seaway authority advises as follows: 30, including 9 Indian residents or organizations in Caughnawaga.

LAPRAIRIE COUNTY—DISPOSITION OF EXPROPRIATED LAND

Question No. 914—**Mr. Boucher:**

Have any of the lands expropriated by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority in the county of Laprairie been sold, rented or donated since such expropriations and, if so, (a) to whom and (b) under what terms and conditions?

Mr. McBain: The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows:

There have been no sales or donations by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of lands expropriated by it in the county of Laprairie. There have been seven conveyances of parcels of these lands by way of lease. Three of these leases, for a term during the pleasure of the Authority, have been to construction companies, Baillargeon & Fournier Inc., Construction Equipment Company Limited and Key Construction Company Limited, for temporary shelter or storage of construction materials; the lease to Key Construction has been terminated recently. Two more of these leases were to construction companies, Rivermont Construction Company Limited and J. M. Langlois Inc., for the area necessary to the operation of stone crushing plants; both of these leases are now terminated. Another lease, also during pleasure, is in favour of Mr. Armand St-Germain to enable him to