

Questions

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The following answers, deposited with the Clerk of the house, are printed in the official report of debates pursuant to standing order 39:

NATIONAL DEFENCE—CONTRIBUTION TO ROAD PAVING, PARENT, QUE.

Question No. 123—Mr. Argue:

1. In 1959, did the Department of National Defence contribute in any way to the cost of paving approximately one mile of the main road through the village of Parent, Laviolette county, Quebec, including the raising of several manholes of existing sewers?

2. If so: (a) for what reason? (b) what was the cost involved to the Department of National Defence? (c) who was responsible for the work carried out in regard to (i) planning (ii) supervision (iii) actually doing the work? (d) in the event that the Department of National Defence was responsible for any item under (c), why was the department thus responsible?

Answer by: Hon. D. S. Harkness (Minister of National Defence):

1. Yes.

2. (a) To improve the road access to R.C.A.F. station Parent.

(b) \$42,792.92 with the village of Parent committed by an agreement, dated June 17, 1958, to contribute 25 per cent of this amount.

- (c) (i) Department of National Defence.
(ii) Defence Construction Limited.
(iii) Paquin Construction Company, Val D'Or, P.Q.

(d) The requirements for suitable road service to station Parent could not be met by the resources of the local municipal authority. Recognizing a measure of responsibility for the condition of the street and in the interests of economy and efficiency, the Department of National Defence by agreement with the village of Parent undertook the rebuilding and surfacing of that portion of the village street which forms part of the access road to station Parent.

AUTOMATIC CROSSING PROTECTION, EDINBURGH DRIVE, MONCTON

Question No. 146—Mr. Creaghan:

1. Did the board of transport commissioners for Canada receive an application from the Department of Public Works of the province of New Brunswick for the installation of automatic protection of the railway level crossing at Edinburgh drive in the greater Moncton area?

2. If so, when was the request received, and what is the present status of the same?

3. If a grade separation was requested instead of automatic protection, to what extent would the board authorize a grant from the railway grade crossing fund, and how would the balance of the cost be apportioned, including future maintenance?

Answer by: Hon. Leon Balcer (Minister of Transport):

The board of transport commissioners for Canada advise as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The New Brunswick department of public works submitted a letter to the board dated February 3, 1961 requesting that automatic protection be installed at the level crossing across the Canadian National Railways at Edinburgh drive in greater Moncton area and by letter dated February 23, 1961 withdrew its request for protection at this crossing, advising that the department proposes to make an application for a grade separation at this location.

3. The board may authorize a grant from the railway grade crossing fund to the extent of 80 per cent of the cost of constructing a grade separation which will eliminate an existing level crossing which has been in existence for at least three years not to exceed, however, the sum of \$500,000. If the total cost of constructing a grade separation does not exceed \$625,000 and if a grant is authorized from the railway grade crossing fund to the extent of 80 per cent of the cost of construction, the railway company is required to pay 5 per cent and the highway authority having jurisdiction over the highway is required to pay 15 per cent, all in accordance with section 9 of the board's general order 848. If the total cost of a grade separation is in excess of \$625,000, the board may authorize a grant from the railway grade crossing fund, not to exceed \$500,000, with the balance of the cost to be borne and paid by the railway company and the highway authority in accordance with agreement reached between the railway company and the highway authority, or as the board may direct. The cost of future maintenance of such grade separation would be borne by the highway authority in the case of an overhead bridge and by the railway company in the case of a subway.