

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

arrived at a formula for obtaining options on the four sites which are particularly under consideration?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Meetings between representatives of the two governments and the officials took place yesterday or the day before. I am not sure how much progress was made; they have not reported to me as yet. But I am hopeful they will do so within the next day or two.

\* \* \*

**HOUSING****MONTREAL—EFFECTS OF PROPOSED EXPRESSWAY—  
REPLACEMENT BY UNDERGROUND PROJECT**

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Earlier in the week, Mr. Speaker, I addressed a question to the acting minister in charge of housing. I now direct it to the minister himself in the light of the statement made by the Secretary of State that the project for an expressway in Montreal, which would butcher residential districts and demolish some 2,000 houses, should be replaced by an alternative scheme to provide for an underground expressway. Will the minister undertake to look into this matter and explore what action might be taken by the federal government to encourage the one project and discourage the other?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Any decision with regard to an expressway would, of course, be the prerogative of the government of the Province of Quebec. However, we are extremely conscious of the need for housing in Montreal. In fact, we have invested, in greater Montreal through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, some \$150 million during the past year to produce about 12,000 lower income housing units there. I shall be discussing this matter with my counterpart in the Province of Quebec, but I would not venture to make any further comment about the expressway at this time.

**Mr. Brewin:** Would the minister consider discussing with his government colleagues the possibility of providing some incentive for constructing an underground expressway which would not result in the demolition of housing, rather than the present plan?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

\* \* \*

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE****DISCONTINUANCE OF SUPPLEMENTARY COMPANY PAY-  
MENTS FOLLOWING INCREASE IN BENEFITS**

**Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour, but in view of his absence I will direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary. Is it the intention of the Department of Labour to permit companies providing supplementary unemployment insurance benefits to take advantage of increases in unemployment insurance benefits to reduce the company's contributions?

[Mr. Ryan.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The question as asked contains allegations, but perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary might give a quick answer to the question.

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the Minister of Labour it should not be the intention of any companies providing supplementary unemployment insurance benefits, including Devco, to take advantage of the increase in unemployment insurance benefits to reduce company contributions. Regulations will be introduced that will specify in general terms—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member is now making a statement.

\* \* \*

**HOUSING****PROVISION OF REASONABLE RENTAL ACCOMMODATION  
FOR ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL**

**Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence which is a follow-up to a question I asked his colleague the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing on December 4. May I ask whether the minister has had time to explore ways by which, hopefully, more economic housing might be provided members of the armed forces serving in posts where married quarters are not available?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank my hon. friend for notice of his question. In response to his specific question of December 4, may I say we have had extensive discussions with CMHC in this regard, but because an essentially federal agency is involved none of the \$40 million will be made available at the federal level; it will all be made available to the provincial governments.

Having said that, however, we are very concerned with the impact of high rents on members of the armed forces, particularly in some of the larger metropolitan centres. We have been having extensive discussions with housing authorities with regard to the possibility of trying to alleviate this problem. At the moment, I am afraid I have nothing very promising to indicate either to the hon. member or to the members of the armed forces.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS****PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE TO HOTEL EMPLOYEES**

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, since this is probably, and hopefully, the last day before the Christmas recess, may I take advantage of this occasion to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour whether there is any change in the status of CN hotel employees in relation to the federal minimum wage law. My question is prompted by the fact that there are a number of unions in the process of negotiat-