about \$112,000 worth of chinaware, of which 20 per cent was of Canadian origin and the prices. balance of foreign make.

2. It is company policy to buy for use in Canada materials, equipment and supplies of Canadian origin wherever possible. A product of foreign manufacture is purchased only in cases where no suitable alternatives is produced in Canada or where the foreign product has cost or other advantages that cannot be matched by Canadian suppliers. In this instance, the chinaware purchased from foreign sources was of a type not made by or available from Canadian firms.

T.C.A. PURCHASE OF CHINAWARE

Question No. 2,405-Mr. Pigeon:

1. Since May 1, 1963, did T.C.A. purchase any chinaware and, if so (a) was it of Canadian or foreign origin (b) what was the total amount of purchases in each case?

2. If T.C.A. did purchase chinaware of foreign origin, for what reasons was Canadian made chinaware not purchased?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Trans-Canada Air Lines advise as follows:

1 and 2. From May 1, 1963, to date Trans-Canada Air Lines purchased \$25,000 worth of English bone chinaware from Royal Stafford, Staffordshire, England. This includes \$15,000 spent last July for the introduction of chinaware on the first class DC-8 domestic service.

Canadian made chinaware was not purchased because Trans-Canada Air Lines have been unable to locate a Canadian source offering a product of comparable quality, although there is a Quebec firm which has been provided with samples of Trans-Canada Air Lines chinaware, in the hope that it can match the quality and colour.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT PURCHASE OF CHINAWARE

Question No. 2,406-Mr. Pigeon:

1. Since May 1, 1963, did the Department of Transport purchase any chinaware and, if so (a) was it of Canadian or foreign origin (b) what was the total amount of purchase in each case?

2. If the department did purchase chinaware of foreign origin, for what reason was Canadian made chinaware not purchased?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes, (a) both, (b) Canadian origin, \$6,340.39, Foreign origin, \$6,439.06.

2. Reasons for purchase of foreign origin chinaware were as follows:

Questions

- (a) Canadian manufacturer quoted higher prices.
- (b) Items not quoted on by Canadian manufacturer.
- (c) Replacements were for part sets of chinaware previously purchased from other firms.
- (d) Small quantities requested were part of a lengthy list of household effects purchased from one only supplier.

INDUSTRY DEPARTMENT PURCHASE OF CHINAWARE

Question No. 2,407-Mr. Pigeon:

1. Since May 1, 1963, did the Department of Industry purchase any chinaware and, if so (a) was it of Canadian or foreign origin (b) what

was the total amount of purchases in each case?

2. If the department did purchase chinaware of foreign origin, for what reason was Canadian made chinaware not purchased?

[Translation]

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1 and 2. No.

[Text]

GROUND TRANSPORT TO AIRPORTS

Question No. 2,409—Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):

Does the Department of Transport exercise any control over the choice of firms providing ground transportation for Air Canada and, if so (a) what standards of safety and comfort are set and, (b) how are these standards enforced?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The department enters into contracts for ground transportation service with operators who hold provincial public vehicle licences.

The contracts provide for transportation to and from the airport to meet the scheduled flights, and that vehicles shall be of recent manufacture, neat and maintained in good running condition.

Air Canada also negotiates service contracts with the operators. The operators work closely with Air Canada to maintain a satisfactory standard of service, and at major airports the operators deal with an air line committee.

MONEY LOST THROUGH CHEQUE TAMPERING

Question No. 2,411—Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):

Does any department of the government keep records of money lost through tampering with cheques and, if so, what was the total loss in each of the last five years?