

Questions

5. Initial installed capacity will be 187.5 megawatts. The cost of this installation will be \$132.00 per kilowatt. This figure includes 100 per cent of the cost of penstocks, power plant, and engineering, but does not include any costs of construction of the dam.

6. Yes.

7. There has been no indication from the government of Saskatchewan that it will not be proceeding with the irrigation development.

8. Project benefits other than irrigation and power:

(1) Urban and industrial water supplies: the availability of water directly from the reservoir and from the Qu'Appelle river diversion will assure domestic and industrial supplies for many towns and cities in southern Saskatchewan.

(2) River regulations: The storage provided in the reservoir and the associated river control will greatly increase power benefits downstream at all present and future sites.

(3) Recreation: The reservoir will be within 100 miles of 400,000 Saskatchewan people and lies in the area which is short of water for recreational purposes.

(4) Interbasin diversions: In the event of large scale interbasin diversions in the future, the South Saskatchewan river reservoir will become the hub of a major water supply system for storage and redistribution to water short areas in southern Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

9. There have been technical difficulties encountered in the construction of the tunnels as well as some parts of the embankment which in some cases have resulted in delays in the work schedule.

10 and 11. The cost of this project is not being amortized. Canada's share of the cost is considered to be in the form of a direct contribution for agricultural rehabilitation and development purposes.

Note: Information in regard to the provincial program and cost has been provided by the South Saskatchewan river development commission of the province of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

DEFENCE AND RESEARCH EXPENDITURES, B.C.

Question No. 966—Mr. Basford:

1. For the fiscal years 1962-63, 1963-64, what grants in aid of research were made by the defence research board within the province of British Columbia and, to whom, in what amounts, and for what projects?

2. For the fiscal years 1962-63, 1963-64, what expenditures were made within the province of British Columbia, under the development sharing assistance program of the Department of Defence Production and, to whom, in what amounts, and for what projects were such expenditures made?

3. For the fiscal years 1962-63, 1963-64, what contracts were let for production within British Columbia of military equipment and material under the auspices of the Canada-United States defence development and production sharing program, and with whom were such contracts made, the value thereof, and what was the equipment and material to be produced or supplied thereunder?

Mr. Lamontagne: In so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned.

1. 1962-63, \$187,435; 1963-64, \$190,005.

The amounts, projects and other details relating to these grants are classified military information.

In so far as the Department of Defence Production is concerned.

2. None.

3. Companies within British Columbia received contracts for military equipment and material under the auspices of the Canada-U.S. defence development and production sharing program amounting to \$1,997,915 for the fiscal year 1962-63 and \$1,327,426 for the fiscal year 1963-64. Details of contracts placed by the U.S. military services, or subcontracts thereunder, are provided to the Canadian government on a confidential basis as they have been awarded in competition with U.S. firms, paid for by the U.S. military departments and do not involve the payment of Canadian government funds.

*URANIUM STOCKPILING IN BANCROFT AREA

Question No. 983—Mr. Lamb:

Does the government intend to stockpile uranium in the Bancroft area in order to keep the Cardiff mine in operation?

Mr. Pepin: The answer is no.

PETITIONS RESPECTING CATV

Question No. 993—Mr. McBain:

1. How many letters, petitions, telegrams, etc., with total number of signatures, have been received by the Prime Minister and/or the Minister of Transport from viewers of CATV protesting the imposition of any discriminatory regulations on such service?

2. On what date will the government set up a special committee on broadcasting to which the matter of CATV service might be referred?

Mr. Lamontagne: 1. Number of letters, petitions, telegrams, etc., 1,719; total number of signatures, 2,155.

2. As indicated in a reply to a question in the house on May 25, 1964, the government does not propose the establishment of a special committee on broadcasting during the present session. (Hansard, p. 3522).

TRAIN SERVICE FROM NORTH TO MONTREAL

Question No. 995—Mr. Laprise:

In order to improve travel services, is it intended to shorten the time required for the rail trip between Cochrane and Montreal, and between