

Order Paper Questions

Number of Claims Paid by the Mortgage Insurance Fund, 1967-71
NHA Section 8

Year	Approved Lenders (Sec. 6)		CMHC (Sec. 58)		Total	
	No. of Loans Outstanding ¹	No. of Claims Paid	No. of Loans Outstanding ¹	No. of Claims Paid	No. of Loans Outstanding ¹	No. of Claims Paid
1967.....	265,312	113	206,247	235	471,559	348
1968.....	276,948	28	216,428	131	493,376	159
1969.....	280,983	41	228,427	135	509,410	176
1970.....	300,470	57	241,020	98	541,490	155
1971.....	345,862	116	247,488	94	593,350	210

¹As at December 31st.

STRONTIUM 90

Question No. 218—**Mr. Forrestall:**

By region in Canada, what was the strontium 90 level at the end of (a) January 1970 (b) January 1971 (c) January 1972?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The strontium 90 levels, in units of picocuries per litre of milk, are as follows:

	January 1970	January 1971	January 1972
British Columbia	8.0	7.2	5.9
Prairie Provinces	8.2	6.6	6.9
Ontario	7.4	8.0	7.6
Quebec	8.1	8.4	8.3
Maritime Provinces	10.7	9.7	9.7
Newfoundland	16.0	11.8	14.0

FORESTVILLE AIRPORT

Question No. 242—**Mr. Caouette (Charlevoix):**

What were the costs of (a) construction of the airport at Forestville (b) maintenance of the airport since its opening (c) repairs and improvements since that date?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): (a) Construction cost, excluding land purchase, of the airport at Forestville was \$469,000; (b) The airport is maintained by the municipality and received an average of \$4,000 per year in operating subsidies from 1961 to 1969 inclusive. It ceased to be eligible in 1970 when Class II service was discontinued; (c) Improvement has been made in the form of an NDB building at a cost of \$11,000; (NDB: Non-directional beacon).

REMOVAL OF COAT OF ARMS PLAQUE FROM CUSTOMS OFFICE, JOHNSTOWN, ONTARIO

Question No. 243—**Mr. Cossit:**

Was the Canadian Coat of Arms removed from the main wall of the Canada Customs Office at the Port of Johnstown, Ontario, at some point prior to October 30, 1972 and, if so (a) what was the source of the instructions to the Collector of Customs to make this removal (b) for what reason were such instructions later reversed?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister of National Revenue): Yes, it was removed at the Bridge Customs Office, Johnstown, Ontario. (Port of Prescott). (a) During 1971-72 a survey was taken to determine what unilingual identity signs were in existence in order that the Department could plan a program for conversion to both official lan-

[Mr. Basford.]

guages. The plaque in question containing the Coat of Arms was inadvertently reported as a unilingual sign and removed. (b) It was later determined that this plaque should not have been reported as a unilingual sign.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE OFFICE, PRESCOTT, ONTARIO—
PHOTOGRAPH OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II
AND PRINCE PHILIPQuestion No. 244—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Was a photograph of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip placed on the main wall of the Canada Customs Office at the Port of Johnstown, Ontario, shortly after October 30, 1972 and, if so, what was the source of the instructions to the Collector of Customs in this regard?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister of National Revenue): Yes. Photographs of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip are listed in the Department of Supply and Services catalogue for issue to departmental requisitioning officers on an as required basis. The Collector of Customs and Excise at Prescott, Ontario, within his authority, requisitioned for this photograph to be displayed in the Bridge Customs Office at Johnstown, Ontario. No specific instructions were given to the Collector concerning this matter.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL,
COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTSQuestion No. 254—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. (a) How many collective agreements have been signed by the Department of National Defence and the General Trades and Labourers group of the Union of National Defence Employees in the past four years that involved any retroactive payments of wages (b) on what date were the agreements signed (c) what were the effective and expiry dates?

2. How many workers affected by the collective agreements received retroactive pay back to the effective date of the collective agreements?

3. How many persons affected by these agreements received retroactive pay for a period less than their full period of employment covered in the agreement, because they were designated new personnel according to the Public Service Staff Relations Act, and obliged to serve six months before eligibility for this entitlement?

4. How many persons hired before the expiry date of the former agreements were laid off within a 30 day period prior to the effective date of the renewal agreements, and rehired within a 30 day period after the effective date of the renewal agreements and were thus excluded from receipt of retroactive wages for the first six months of their employment covered by the renewal agree-