

Questions

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—INCOME TAX OFFICES—DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES

**Mr. Harkness:**

1. How many (a) permanent; (b) temporary, employees of the income tax branch of the Department of National Revenue were discharged at each of the offices across Canada as a result of the staff rating program?
2. How many employees did the local rating board in the Calgary office recommend for dismissal?
3. What is the number and date of the order in council under the authority of which the permanent employees were dismissed?

**Mr. McCann:**

1. The following list shows the number of permanent and temporary employees of the Department of National Revenue, taxation division, released in each district office as a result of the staff rating program:

District Office	Permanent	Temporary
St. John's Nfld. ....	..	2
Charlottetown, P.E.I. ..	1	..
Halifax, N.S. ....	3	2
Sydney, N.S. ....	1	4
Saint John, N.B. ....	6	2
Quebec, P.Q. ....	5	3
Sherbrooke, P.Q. ....	1	2
Montreal, P.Q. ....	162	15
Ottawa, Ont. ....	10	1
Kingston, Ont. ....	3	2
Belleville, Ont. ....	1	1
Toronto, Ont. ....	44	18
Hamilton, Ont. ....	25	6
London, Ont. ....	16	2
Fort William, Ont. ....	5	1
Winnipeg, Man. ....	16	3
Regina, Sask. ....	3	2
Saskatoon, Sask. ....	3	4
Edmonton, Alta. ....	1	4
Calgary, Alta. ....	6	..
Vancouver, B.C. ....	5	9
Head Office ....	13	4
Totals .....	330	87

2. The local rating board in the Calgary office recommended one employee for release.
3. The order in council which is the authority for the release of permanent employees as a result of the rating program is P.C. 63/5922, dated November 3, 1951.

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION, HAMILTON, ONT.—DISMISSAL OF CIVIL SERVANTS

**Mr. Lennard:**

1. How many permanent civil servants were released from the department of taxation at the Hamilton office during 1951?
2. Why were they dismissed?
3. Who dismissed them and upon whose recommendation?
4. Were they given an opportunity to appeal? If not, why were appeals not allowed?

**Mr. McCann:**

1. Twenty-five civil servants were released from the Department of National Revenue, taxation division, Hamilton office, in 1951.
2. They were released because their qualifications and experience did not suit them for further employment under the revised procedures being followed in the taxation division.
3. By authority of the minister, the employees referred to were released upon the recommendation of rating boards responsible for their rating.
4. The formal appeal procedure of the civil service commission was not available to the individuals released since the responsibility for the release program rested with the Department of National Revenue, taxation division. Each employee, however, could have his case reviewed, at his request, by the deputy minister.

WHEAT BOARD—VACANCIES IN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. How many vacancies are there at the present time in the advisory committee to the wheat board?
2. Is consideration being given to the filling of these vacancies by appointment to such vacancies of bona fide farmers?

**Mr. McIlraith:**

1. There are no vacancies on the advisory committee at the present time.
2. See answer to No. 1.

INSULIN—PRICES—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN PRODUCTION

**Mr. McCulloch:**

1. Has the government any information as to the comparative prices of insulin in Canada and the United States?
2. If so, what are such prices?
3. Do any Canadian firms receive a subsidy from the federal government to assist in the production of insulin?

**Mr. McCusker:**

1. Yes. Comparative prices of insulin in Canada and the United States have been secured from the Connaught Laboratories, Toronto, the only manufacturer of insulin in Canada, and from the Eli Lilly Company, Indianapolis, the largest manufacturer of insulin in the United States.
- 2.

	Canada	United States
40 unit insulin .....	\$ .83	\$ 1.40
80 unit insulin .....	1.60	2.75
40 unit protamine zinc insulin .....	.96	1.65
80 unit protamine zinc insulin .....	1.85	3.15