

of the National Harbours Board, be produced to the committee. Following debate on this motion—which I understood took some time—the motion was carried on division, yeas 10; nays 3.

Then there appears in the evidence of Thursday, April 28, this rather strange procedure, wherein it is stated that Mr. McGregor moved, and Mr. Pigeon seconded, that certain papers regarding the investigation by C.N.R. officials be produced. This is the chairman speaking:

I have spoken to Mr. McGregor since, and I believe he is willing to withdraw that motion. Is that right, Mr. McGregor?

Mr. MCGREGOR: I understood there was nothing of any importance in the letters, so if there is nothing of importance I wish to withdraw the motion.

Mr. PIGEON: I second that.

Well, here is a motion that was discussed at some length, I understand, and passed by a vote of ten to three, and Mr. McGregor now states that they are letters which he understands are of no importance, although the motion concerned, not letters, but reports of investigations in the hands of the National Harbours Board.

I am not complaining about the motion, but what I am complaining about is the fact that here we pass motions by a standing vote, and then the next day, or the day after, we withdraw them. And that was done on several occasions. That was done, also, in the case of Mr. Pigeon, who moved that certain confidential letters in the hands of the National Harbours Board be produced, and who—after reflection, I suppose—decided to withdraw the motion. I do not know; I have no recollection as to whether that motion was put to a vote or not at the time, but I do have a recollection that it was withdrawn.

I raise these two matters simply to bring to the attention of the committee that there appears to me—and I say this with all deference to you, Mr. Chairman, because I know you are doing a difficult job, and doing it well—to be, in the procedure, as well as in the calling of witnesses, not the order and the discipline there should be; because after all, if these motions are going to be made and, when they displease certain people, or when they are not to the liking of certain people, the next day they are withdrawn, will that same procedure and that same consideration be given to those of us who sit on this side?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier, as regards the personal and confidential letters, they were referred to the steering committee, and the steering committee reported back. That was Mr. Pigeon's motion. They were referred back here to this committee, and this committee said that they were not necessary. They took the advice of the subcommittee on that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What about the motion of Mr. McGregor that was made and carried by a vote?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGregor withdrew it at the next meeting, and the committee unanimously agreed with the request for the withdrawal by Messrs. McGregor and Pigeon respectively. They were the mover and the seconder of the motion which had been carried on April 26 regarding the production of confidential reports of the Canadian National Railways investigations on toll collectors on the Jacques Cartier bridge.

That was done owing to the fact that, despite the fact that the inspectors' names were not mentioned—they were in code letters—names of toll collectors were in those reports, and it was felt that it would not be advisable at that time to put those on record and have them printed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: But the motion, Mr. Chairman, that was made was for the production of certain confidential reports, and the motion to withdraw was regarding letters, which is an entirely different thing.