

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): The Canadian National Railway Company advises as follows:

On June 5th, 1989, it was discovered during a regular CN track inspection of the Chapais subdivision, that the roadbed at mileage 106.20 had been eroded by heavy rainfalls.

(a) The incident in question was immediately reported by the inspection officer.

(b) On June 6th, CN management took photographs of the site and evaluated extent of damages.

(c) Cost of needed repairs was evaluated at \$10,000 and the time to complete work and restore train service, if needed, was estimated to be less than 48 hours. Train movement being nil, at this time, it was management's decision to delay repairs until service requirements justified the restoration of train operations.

PASSENGER TRAIN NUMBER 135

Question No. 121—Mr. St-Julien:

On or about February 20, 1989, was VIA Rail forced to cancel a passenger train (No. 135) at mileage point 82.4 on the La Tuque subdivision, between Montreal and Senneterre, because of a problem with engine No. 6504 and, if so (a) what was the cause of the problem (b) what was the number of passengers carried on the train (c) how much time did the train remain in La Tuque (d) how many taxicabs were dispatched by VIA Rail to Québec City, Hervey Junction, Garneau, Shawinigan and Montreal (i) for what number of passengers and (ii) at what cost (e) how many buses did VIA Rail rent to transport the passengers (i) to which destination (ii) at what cost (f) what was the cost to VIA Rail of meals and rooms provided to passengers in La Tuque?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Via Rail Canada Inc. advises as follows:

(a) to (f) At 23:15 on 20 February 1989, train number 135 en route from Montreal to Senneterre with 66 passengers on board advised the dispatcher from mileage point 82.4 on the Lac St-Jean subdivision that locomotive 6506 was experiencing a problem due to blown fuses.

At 23:55 the locomotive was shut down at mileage point 87. CN called to obtain a crew and replacement

locomotive from Fitzpatrick, as the train was stopped in a remote area with no road access. The only locomotive available was facing the wrong way and it was estimated that it would take two hours to turn it around and put it in service on account of the heavy snow in the yard. The rescue locomotive departed Fitzpatrick at 02:00 and arrived at mileage 87 at 03:15, where the situation had deteriorated because boiler problems had developed on locomotive number 3542. At 04:30 the steam generating unit shut down.

Via contacted the La Tuque station to inquire about accommodation and food for passengers, 44 of whom were bound for Weymount and 12 for Parent. At 06:05 the train arrived in La Tuque, but steam power was still unavailable.

Two buses were chartered from nearby Chevette, one bound for Weymount, at a cost of \$544, and the other for Parent, at a cost of \$533.

The 10 remaining passengers headed to remote areas beyond La Tuque were given the option of staying in La Tuque at Via's expense until the next frequency (two days later) or being taxied to their points of origin: Grand'mère, Shawinigan, Hervey and Hébertville. All passengers opted to return home. The fares for the five taxis totalled \$720. Also breakfast was served to all passengers at a cost of \$287.

APPLICATIONS FOR PROJECT FUNDING

Question No. 123—Mr. Young (Beaches—Woodbine):

Since 1984, did UNIGEC of Chicoutimi, Quebec, make any applications for project funding to the Canadian International Development Agency and, if so (a) what was the title of each project (b) what was the nature of each project (c) what was the location of each project (d) what was the amount of funding requested for each project (e) what service was UNIGEC to provide to each project (f) on what date were the applications made (g) on what date were the applications approved or rejected (h) if rejected, what were the reasons given for the rejection (*iti*ro) subsequent to any of the applications being made, did any person or persons make an intervention with respect to the application, and if so, what is the name of such person(*ros) and what was the purpose of the intervention?