

Starred Questions

Mr. Hazen Argue (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, we are glad that the government is continuing to support sugar beet prices. This, however, seems to follow the consistent pattern of recent announcements, namely that the support prices are often lower. We are pleased that the lowering of the price has not been more than one-tenth cent per pound, but with the continuing increase in the cost of agricultural production we are looking to the time when the government will implement its policy of providing floor prices based on the farmer's cost of production and therefore floor prices that would increase as the farmer's cost of production increases. The government is following the opposite policy from that which we were led to expect, in that it continues to reduce support prices.

Mr. Churchill: You are out of order.

Mr. Harkness: I think you will find that the sugar beet growers are very well satisfied.

Mr. Argue: In response to that interjection I might say that I have found—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Argue:—that many of the minister's interpolations in the past have been highly inaccurate.

Mr. Ricard: It is impossible to satisfy that hon. gentleman or the party he represents.

INDUSTRY

MEASURE TO PROMOTE INDUSTRY AND REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Mr. R. C. Coates (Cumberland) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-51, to provide for the development of certain provinces by the distribution of industry and for the reduction of unemployment therein.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is twofold, to encourage the development of industry in the four maritime provinces and to reduce high-level unemployment by the development of industry in areas in those provinces where unemployment persists. The method used is to adapt the facilities of the Industrial Development Bank Act, which is general to all Canada, to the specific economic needs of the maritime provinces.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

STARRED QUESTIONS

EXPLORATORY OIL AND GAS PERMITS, NORTHERN CANADA—ACREAGES

Question No. 74—Mr. Hardie:

1. For what total acreage, if any, were exploratory oil and gas permits issued between July 1, 1957 and March 31, 1959, on the mainland of

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

northern Canada i.e. in the Mackenzie district of the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon?

2. What percentage of any such acreage under permit rights is held by (a) Canadian corporations; (b) United States corporations; (c) Canadian subsidiaries of United States corporations; (d) British corporations; (e) Canadian subsidiaries of British corporations; (f) others?

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is 60,942,006 acres.

The answer to the second question, part (a), is 29.32 per cent (17,918,074 acres); part (b), 33.22 per cent (20,203,085 acres); part (c), 30.06 per cent (18,294,054 acres); part (d) nil; part (e) nil; part (f), 7.40 per cent (4,526,793 acres).

These figures, Mr. Speaker, refer just to the mainland of northern Canada, that is, the Mackenzie district of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. In answer to a previous question on April 29, asked by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. McIlraith), a set of figures were given. To get the total for the whole of the northern part of Canada these two sets of figures should be added together.

So there will be no misunderstanding as to the figures which were reported at that time, and for the interest of the house, the percentages are as follows: Canadian individuals and corporations for the whole of the north since July 1, 1957, 55.54 per cent (81,912,041 acres); United States corporations, 22.34 per cent (32,941,271 acres); Canadian subsidiaries of United States corporations, 20.22 per cent (29,828,608 acres); British corporations, nil; Canadian subsidiaries of British corporations, 1.90 per cent (2,777,452 acres).

Mr. G. J. McIlraith (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a question of privilege, since my name has been brought into the answer to the question. The minister in answering the question sought to refer to an answer given to a question I asked some days ago. He did not give the full answer. He repeated only part of it. In that case the answer given did not deal with permits issued at all, and his present answer is therefore quite misleading to the house. Since it purports to involve information given to me I want to be dissociated in every way from anything he said indicating that the figures he has now given were given to me previously and are related to this question.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I am perfectly willing to have the hon. member for Ottawa West dissociate himself from these facts I have just given to the house.