

## Questions

and welfare for British Columbia—neither of them critical of any feature of either the proposed legislation or the regulations.

The minister of health and welfare for British Columbia was invited in September, 1954, to attend a conference called for the purpose of formulating, jointly with the federal and other provincial governments, the regulations under the Disabled Persons Act. The minister did not attend this conference, but was represented by two senior officials of the British Columbia department of health and welfare. The minutes of this meeting contain no reference to any remarks made by the said British Columbia officials which could under any circumstances be interpreted as a protest against the regulations. The only important comment of substance offered by the British Columbia representatives referred to that part of the disability definition which has to do with "permanency". In the opinion of the British Columbia authorities a stated number of years was preferable as the criterion of permanency to the wording contained in the regulation "to which the concept of cure cannot be applied". Apart from this suggestion, not a single critical comment on the regulations has been offered to federal authorities by the British Columbia authorities at any time from January, 1954, when the question was first discussed to the present.

#### MARITIME COAL—SUBVENTIONS ON WESTERN MOVEMENT

##### Mr. Buchanan:

1. What assistance, through federal subventions, has been given to the movement of coal from the maritimes westward to other provinces in the following fiscal years: 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954?

2. What is the breakdown of amounts on shipments from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for each of the above years?

3. Has any change in policy or the payment of these subventions taken place during the above years? If so, when and in what form?

4. Are figures available to show coal shipments from the Cape Breton area? If so, what quantities, and what is the amount of subventions in each of the above years?

##### Mr. Prudham:

1. The following assistance, through federal subventions, has been given to the movement of coal from the maritimes westward to other provinces in the undernoted fiscal years: 1949-50, \$2,657,545; 1950-51, \$1,399,030; 1951-52, \$3,260,050; 1952-53, \$4,777,335; 1953-54, \$7,214,708.

2. The breakdown of amounts on shipments from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for

[Mr. Robertson.]

each of the above years is as follows: Nova Scotia coal: 1949-50, \$2,653,604; 1950-51, \$1,397,041; 1951-52, \$3,257,627; 1952-53, \$4,773,616; 1953-54, \$7,127,469. New Brunswick coal: 1949-50, \$3,941; 1950-51, \$1,989; 1951-52, \$2,423; 1952-53, \$3,719; 1953-54, \$87,239.

3. Policy generally has remained that of providing transportation assistance to enable the Canadian coals to meet the competition from imported coals in designated market areas. Consistent with this policy subventions during the years concerned have been increased and extended. The changes in payment have been effected by the relevant orders in council enacted from time to time during the period in question and these changes have been recorded in the annual reports of the dominion coal board.

4. Figures are available showing coal shipments under subvention from Cape Breton, but by calendar year only. These figures are given below for the years concerned.

#### Tonnages and Costs of Cape Breton Coal Shipped Under Subvention

|            | Net Tons  | Amount     |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| 1950 ..... | 1,093,781 | \$ 929,625 |
| 1951 ..... | 2,220,506 | 3,002,685  |
| 1952 ..... | 1,875,339 | 5,157,003  |
| 1953 ..... | 1,809,247 | 5,960,764  |
| 1954 ..... | 2,399,673 | 8,232,932  |

#### ST. JAMES, MAN., STORM SEWER

##### Mr. Churchill:

1. Is a storm sewer to be constructed from the Royal Canadian Air Force airfield in St. James to the Assiniboine river? If so, when and of what type?

2. What route will the proposed storm sewer follow through the municipality of St. James?

3. What is the estimated cost and what is the financial obligation, if any, of the municipality?

4. Has agreement been reached with the municipality as to the type of storm sewer?

##### Mr. Blachette:

1. Yes. It is expected that construction will begin in the near future and that the sewer will probably be of the open cut type.

2. The exact route is still under consideration.

3. It is estimated that the cost of constructing the sewer will be approximately \$350,000. The municipality has no financial obligation in connection with this project.

4. An agreement was reached with the municipality for the point construction of a storm sewer to serve both the needs of the municipality and the R.C.A.F. station; however, the municipality has since advised that it wishes to withdraw from the agreement.