

Questions

ENCOURAGEMENT FOR SUGAR BEET INDUSTRY

Question No. 1,537—Mr. Thomas:

Will the government consider additional encouragement and stabilization for the sugar beet industry in Canada, with a view to (a) expanding our domestic production of sugar (b) creating more job opportunities in Canada (c) improving our external balance of payments?

Mr. Hays: At present the price of sugar beets grown in Canada is stabilized under the Agricultural Stabilization Act by a deficiency payment program. This program is based on the relationship between the average declared value of imported raw sugar and the price received by Canadian producers for the sugar in their beets and it is considered that the policy effectively protects Canadian producers against downward fluctuations in world sugar prices. The current level of support is 109 per cent of the base price which is the 10 year average price that Canadian producers have received for their beets. The support program and level is reviewed annually.

It is considered that current sugar prices should be adequate to provide for any reasonable and economic expansion of the domestic beet sugar industry.

REFUND CLAIMS FOR TAX ON BUILDING MATERIALS

Question No. 1,539—Mr. Ricard:

From June 14, 1963 to October 26, 1963, following the change made to the tax rate on building materials from 11 per cent to 4 per cent, how many persons claimed refunds, and what was the total amount of these claims?

Mr. Garland: Information not available. Refund claims are not filed nor are they tabulated by the department according to commodities. Adjustments made by licensees in the course of business are recorded in their accounts and subject to audit but are not recorded as refunds by the department as they do not involve the filing of claims or payments from the consolidated revenue.

STAMP SALES AND COSTS

Question No. 1,542—Mr. Belanger:

1. What was the amount paid by Canadians for postal stamps of all denominations during the fiscal year 1962-63?

2. How much have these stamps cost the government of Canada or the Post Office Department?

3. To whom have the amounts mentioned in the preceding question been paid?

Mr. Denis: 1. \$91,723,497.24.

2. \$1,286,834.

3. To the Canadian Bank Note Company, Limited, Ottawa, the British American Bank Note Company, Limited, Ottawa and the International Envelope Limited, Montreal.

CO-OPERATION IN MANAGEMENT OF MONTREAL HARBOUR

Question No. 1,543—Mr. Latulippe:

Does the government intend to amend, in the near future, statutes relating to the Montreal harbour and the national harbours board, in order to promote increased co-operation between municipal, provincial and federal authorities in the management of the Montreal harbour?

[Translation]

Mr. Cantin: Since this is a question of government policy, any announcement in that connection would be made in the usual manner.

[Text]

GROUPING OF TOURIST INDUSTRY AGENCIES

Question No. 1,548—Mr. Latulippe:

Does the government intend to examine the possibility of grouping under the authority of the Department of Industry all boards and departmental branches which deal with the tourist industry in Canada?

Mr. Drury: Under the provisions of the Department of Industry Act, the duties, powers and functions of the minister extend only to matters relating to manufacturing industries.

DEPORTATION ORDER AGAINST BARNABE GARCIA

Question No. 1,555—Mr. Martineau:

1. Was a deportation order issued against Mr. Barnabe Garcia and, if so, for what reasons?

2. Did Mr. Garcia lodge an appeal against this order?

Mr. Munro: 1. Yes; under section 19(1)(e)(x) of the Immigration Act in that he came into Canada as a member of a crew and, without the approval of an immigration officer, remained in Canada after the departure of the vehicle on which he came to Canada.

2. Yes.

CHRYSLER COMPANY TENDER FOR STAKE TRUCKS

Question No. 1,556—Mr. Lambert:

1. With reference to the reply to question number 1,500, what were the names of the four firms who tendered, indicating the amount of each firm's tender?

2. In what way did the vehicles offered by the lowest tenderer not meet the requirements of the specifications?

Mr. Drury: 1. General Motors Products of Canada, Oshawa, Ontario, \$3,130,017.20; Chrysler Canada Ltd., Windsor, Ontario, \$3,130,600.20; Ford Motor Company of Canada Ltd., Oakville, Ontario, \$3,275,252.00; International Harvester Company, Hamilton, Ontario, \$3,595,543.80.

2. The vehicles offered by the lowest tenderer were rejected because of capacity deficiencies in the rear axle and rear springs.