

Questions

POLICY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF JASPER PARK

Question No. 2,431—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

1. Was the hotel-lodge complex proposed for Jasper national park turned down and, if so, for what reason?

2. Has the government decided on any policy as a result of the Oberlander report on Jasper and, if not, when can the residents of Jasper expect some concrete statement as to future plans for their townsite?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. A proposal for the construction of an hotel on a prominent site outside the townsite of Jasper has been turned down for the time being. The national parks branch are currently studying the report on the Jasper townsite prepared by Dr. Oberlander and the submissions with respect to it which have been made by the Jasper chamber of commerce and the Edmonton chamber of commerce with a view to the establishment of an over-all plan for Jasper area development.

2. An announcement has already been made in Jasper that street improvements have been planned for this year. A statement respecting sites for housing, church and motel developments will be made in the near future.

WINTER WORKS PROJECTS, JASPER
PARK

Question No. 2,432—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

1. When will additional residential lots be made available in Jasper park townsite?

2. Could these lots not be made available now to encourage winter house building?

3. What other winter work projects are being carried out in Jasper national park this winter?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. It is planned to make residential lots available to qualified residents of Jasper townsite by this April in accordance with the national parks policy announced by the government on September 18, 1964.

2. No, since the period prior to April is required to select appropriate sites for residential development, for the drafting of the conditions under which these lots will be leased and for calling tenders.

3. A regular work program is being carried out in Jasper national park during the winter months.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

Question No. 2,529—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of November 30, 1964, what is the financial state of the unemployment insurance fund?

[Mr. Laing.]

2. What are its future prospects?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1. On November 30, 1964, the unemployment insurance fund showed a credit balance of \$75,402,411.24.

2. It is expected that the contributions to the unemployment insurance fund will continue to increase the financial state of the fund until some time this month. Starting in January 1965 it is expected that the outgo from the fund will exceed its income.

NAPANEE, ONT.—GRANT IN LIEU OF TAXES

Question No. 2,530—**Mr. Alkenbrack:**

Would the minister give immediate attention to the payment to the town of Napanee, by this government of the grant in lieu of taxes on federal property in the town for the current year in the amount of \$9,000, the same needed at this time in the fiscal economy of the town?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Before the 1964 grant in lieu of taxes to the town of Napanee can be determined it is necessary for a representative of the municipal grants division to visit the town in order to review the federal property assessments. The visit cannot be carried out until early in 1965. To assist the town, an interim payment will be made this month in the amount of \$7,500.

ADVANCES IN CANCER TREATMENT

Question No. 2,532—**Mr. Mather:**

Has any significant advance been made in the successful treatment of cancer during the past ten years?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): While cancer continues to be a major cause of death, there have been important advances in treatment and improvements in survival rates for certain kinds of cancer in recent years.

P.O. DEPARTMENT DISCIPLINARY PAY
REDUCTIONS

Question No. 2,533—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Under what authority, for what reasons and to what extent does the Post Office Department reduce the salaries of its employees as a result of disciplinary measures?

2. Have any employees in the Post Office Department been penalized by a reduction in salary between April 1, 1962 and July 7, 1964, under the Post Office Act and, if so (a) how many (b) what was the sum total of these salary reductions?

3. Has the department taken steps to reimburse the employees so penalized under the Post Office Act and, if not, for what reason?

4. Has reimbursement been made in any case to date and, if so, to what extent?

5. If any employees in the Post Office Department were penalized by a reduction in salary