

## Questions

The selection of the designer, Mr. Kenneth Lockhead of Winnipeg, was performed by a design advisory committee appointed by the Canada Post Office. This committee is composed of six members who are internationally recognized Canadian philatelists or authorities in fields of the visual arts. This advisory committee selects the artists to be commissioned to design each stamp, chooses and approves all design submissions and the finished artwork.

## GLACE BAY HEAVY WATER PLANT

Question No. 1,019—**Mr. Thomson:**

1. Has the Government of Nova Scotia recently requested financial and/or technical assistance from the Government of Canada with respect to the Glace Bay "Heavy Water" plant and, if so, what was the response?
2. Before approving the Heavy Water contract with the Nova Scotia Government, did AECL request full details of the "Spivak process" as to evidence of its success?
3. Did AECL carry out any of its own testing and research of the "Spivak process" and, if so, what were the conclusions?
4. If AECL did not approve of the "Spivak process", why was the "Heavy Water" contract agreed to with the Nova Scotia Government?
5. What method of producing "Heavy Water" is being used by AECL at the Douglas Point plant?
6. Is the government considering a completely independent appraisal of Canada's Atomic Energy Program and, if so, on what date and who will do the appraising?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Prime Minister's and Privy Council Offices and the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited as follows: 1. In July of last year the government of Nova Scotia approached the federal government seeking various forms of assistance with respect to the Glace Bay heavy water plant. Several exchanges have taken place since that time and the matter is still under discussion between the two governments.

2. No. AECL was aware that Deuterium of Canada Limited proposed to use the same basic process as had been successfully used in the U.S.A. for many years, but with some changes covered by "improvement" patents.

3. No.

4. See 2 above.

5. The same basic process i.e. the hydrogen sulphide-water dual temperature isotope exchange process.

[Mr. Kierans.]

6. The government has kept and is keeping Canada's atomic energy program under continuing review and is not at present considering an independent appraisal of that program.

## EXPROPRIATIONS, RICHMOND CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 1,156—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

Have expropriations been carried out by the federal government or any Crown corporation in the constituency of Richmond in 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 and, if so (a) how many (b) what was the site, reason, date and cost of each expropriation?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** (a) During the years 1966 to 1969 the Department of Public Works expropriated one site. (b) Site: St. Adolphe de Dudswell. Reason: To permit construction of a small Post Office. Date: April 26, 1968. Cost: \$2,300.

PATIENTS UNDER DOMICILIARY CARE,  
CAMP HILL HOSPITALQuestion No. 1,171—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many patients are, or were, at Camp Hill Hospital, Halifax, under domiciliary care since October 15, 1969?
2. What range of charges per month did they pay?
3. How many are paying the new maximum charges of \$300 per month?
4. What procedure is followed by the veterans or their families to obtain payments of lesser amounts than \$300 per month?
5. How many domiciliary care patients at Camp Hill Hospital are paying less than half of the increase?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** 1. October, 189; November, 193; December, 192; January, 187.

The above figures include those patients provided with chronic care under Section 29 of the Veterans Treatment Regulations.

2. Charges range from "nil" to \$120 a month.

3. None.

4. The veteran or his family are requested to provide accurate information concerning the veteran's income and assets and the number of dependants so that his ability to pay up to \$120 could be properly assessed after provision was made for all dependants and his personal needs.

5. Not applicable.