both services work in close co-operation. The limited experimental flying patrol during the past season proved a valuable auxiliary to boat patrol.

4. Gear was not actually confiscated by the airplane patrol. On the five days, however, the plane operated, 1,079 lobster traps, 60 lobster crates, 3 anchors, and 5,250 pounds of lobsters were confiscated by patrol boats largely by direction from the air.

5. Prince												25
Queens												15
Kings												33
Total .												73

NAVAL SERVICES-DESTROYERS

Mr. McGregor:

- 1. How many destroyers have been built by the Canadian government since the 1st of January, 1940?
 - 2. What are the names of the said destroyers?
- 3. When was the keel laid in each case and when were the destroyers commissioned?
 - 4. What was the total cost of each?
- 5. What has been the cost of repairs on each since commissioned?

Mr. Baker:

1. Eight.

2. Iroquois, Athabaskan, Huron, Haidabuilt in the United Kingdom; Micmac, Nootka, Cayuga, Athabaskan-built in Canada.

3.	Name	Laid	down	Commissioned
	Iroquois	19-	9-40	10-12-42
	Athabaskan	. 19-	9-40	10-12-42
	(Note: Ath	abask	can, wa	ar loss.)
	Huron	. 15-	7-41	28- 7-43
	Haida	29-	9-41	18- 9-43
	Micmac	20-	5-42	14- 9-45
	Nootka	. 20-	5-42	9- 8-46
	Cayuga	. 7-	10-43	20-10-47
	Athabaskan			
	(new)	. 15-	5-44	20- 2-48

- Athabaskan: \$5,790,333.00; 4. Iroquois. Huron, Haida: \$5,766,673.00; *Micmac, \$8,688,213.87 (includes sales tax); *Nootka, \$8,688,213.87 (includes sales tax); *Cayuga, \$7,647,550.00 (includes sales tax); *Athabaskan (new), \$7,647,550.01 (includes sales tax).
- 5. Athabaskan-war loss-no Iroquois, \$517,611.34 (includes tropicalization); Huron, \$379,040.26; Haida, \$496,956.18 (includes tropicalization); Micmac, \$208,-414.35, \$431,084.02 collision damage; Nootka, \$177,035.27; Cayuga, \$47,078.50; Athabaskan (new), \$61,740.43.

*The contract on Canadian built destroyers has now been completed. These figures include the final adjustments.

Questions

FARM LOAN BOARD-BRITISH COLUMBIA

- 1. At what points in Canada are branches of the farm loan board located?
- 2. Who is responsible for the operation of the board on Vancouver island, British Columbia?
- 3. How many applications for loans were made from British Columbia last year?
 - 4. How many of these were approved?

Mr. Belzile:

- 1. New Westminster, British Columbia; Edmonton, Alberta; Regina, Saskatchewan; Winnipeg, Manitoba; Toronto, Ontario; Quebec, Quebec; Saint John, New Brunswick; Halifax, Nova Scotia; Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.
- 2. Mr. W. S. Palmer, Branch Manager, Canadian farm loan board, New Westminster, B.C.
 - 3. 229.
- 4. Ninety-one have been approved for loan and 28 were still pending as of February 11, 1949. Of the 28 pending applications, 17 of the securities offered have not as yet been appraised.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY NORTH OF ST. CATHARINES, ONT.

Mr. Lockhart:

- 1. Were tenders asked for rural delivery over the area now only partly served by R.R. No. 2 north of St. Catharines, Ontario?
- 2. If so, what are the names of those who tendered?
 - 3. What were the amounts of the tenders received?
 - 4. Have any new contracts been let?

Mr. Bertrand (Laurier):

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Tenders receivable 30th January, 1948: Walter Herbert Howe, Jr., \$1,200; Steve Mako, \$1,600; Levi Mackey, \$1,600; Neil Alexander Wright, \$1,650; John Pietracupa, \$1,700.

Tenders were considered high and each tenderer was given an opportunity to reduce, with the following result: Walter Herbert Howe, Jr., \$1,200; Steve Mako, \$1,600; Levii Mackey, \$1,500; Neil Alexander Wright, \$1,590; John Pietracupa, \$1,550.

Tenders were again invited in October. 1948, in a further effort to secure a reasonable rate with the following result: Thomas Edward Lehan, \$1,200; L. Mackey, \$1,500: John Joseph Dix, \$1,550; John J. Pietracupa,

These last tenders were also considered too high and each tenderer was given an opportunity to reduce, with the following result: Thomas Edward Lehan, \$1,200; L.