

to 1968 is: (a) +32.23%; (b) +19.05%; (c) Canadian airlines only +40.15%; Canadian and Foreign Airlines +49.98%; (d) +50.59%; (e) +62.57%; (f) +46.08%.

2. The percentage increase from 1965 to 1968 is (a) +34.9%; (b) The following represents the actual capital expenditures on radio aids and associated facilities throughout the fiscal years 1962-63 to 1968-69: 1962-63, \$8,168,774; 1963-64, \$8,621,000; 1964-65, \$14,913,512; 1965-66, \$14,980,732; 1966-67, \$12,548,282; 1967-68, \$12,600,000; 1968-69, \$15,512,000. While there was an over-all increase from 1965 to 1968, there was no percentage increase.

*VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—RESUMPTION
OF TRAINING FLIGHTS

Question No. 667—**Mr. Goode:**

Has CPAir resumed Sunday training flights at Vancouver International Airport and, if so, is this in contravention of Department of Transport regulations?

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, CPAir conducts training flights on a continuous basis any day of the week between the hours of 07:00 and 22:00 subject to their training program requirements. They are now conducting an accelerated training program which should continue to April 1971.

The training flights are not in contravention of the Department of Transport regulations.

[English]

POLLUTION—ACTION TAKEN BY STATE OF OHIO AGAINST
DOW CHEMICALS OF CANADA

Question No. 690—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Have the Minister of Justice or the Secretary of State for External Affairs received representations concerning the legal action taken in the Supreme Court of the United States by the State of Ohio against Dow Chemicals of Canada which is being accused of polluting Lake Erie?

2. Is it known whether the Joint International Water Board is aware of this situation and, if so, what was its reaction?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Justice and by the Department of External Affairs as follows: 1. The Department of Justice has been consulted by the Department of External Affairs regarding the action taken in the Supreme Court of the United States by the State of Ohio against Dow Chemicals of Canada, but the Minister of Justice has not received outside representations regarding this action. On December 9, 1970 the Department of External Affairs received a formal inquiry from Mr. V. K. McEwan, Legal Counsel for Dow Chemical of Canada Limited, in the lawsuit before the United States Supreme Court, seeking information regarding what position and steps, if any, the Canadian Government proposed to take in this matter. On

Questions

December 21, Mr. McEwan was advised by letter that the Government of Canada considers the lawsuit instigated by the State of Ohio to be a United States domestic matter. There is, therefore, no basis on which the Government of Canada can or should intervene in any way, be it by representations before the United States Supreme Court or by representations to the Government of the United States. The Government of Canada is, however, very concerned about pollution of the Great Lakes generally, and is working closely with the Government of the United States and the Government of Ontario towards finding solutions to these problems. The Federal Government remains interested in the developments in this case in the context of the general pollution problem and is following them closely.

2. The International Joint Commission is aware of the court case, but since this matter is before the Court it has expressed no restriction in relation to this lawsuit.

SKAGIT VALLEY

Question No. 695—**Mrs. MacInnis:** Supplementary answer

How many letters, telegrams, briefs, representations or other communications have been received concerning the Skagit Valley in the period from June 30 to December 31, 1970?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed as follows: Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, 3,786; Department of External Affairs, 36; Department of Fisheries and Forestry, 357.

AUDITING OF PUBLIC AGENCIES

Question No. 733—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. During the past five years, what was the annual cost of auditing the following public agencies (a) CNR and Air Canada (b) Bank of Canada (c) Industrial Development Bank (d) CMHC (e) Canadian Wheat Board?

2. Are there any plans to appoint the Auditor General as co-auditor for these agencies and, if not, for what reason?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Transport, the Department of Finance, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Canadian Wheat Board and the Treasury Board as follows: 1. (a) Pursuant to Order in Council P.C. 1967-563 the firm of Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart, appointed independent auditors by Section 13 of the CNR Financing and Guarantee Act, 1965-66, was paid \$137,500 plus certain disbursements for each of the years 1966 and 1967, apportioned \$115,000 CNR and \$22,500 Air Canada. Pursuant to Order in Council P.C. 1969-141 the same firm, appointed independent auditors by Section 13 of the CNR F. & G. Act 1967 and Section 15 of the CNR F. & G. Act 1968, was paid \$152,000, plus certain disbursements, for each of the years 1968 and 1969, apportioned \$125,000 railway and \$27,000 airlines. Pursuant to the CNR F. & G.