

2. The sum of \$83,769.68 was paid to the printing bureau by the dominion franchise commissioner for the printing of the revised list of electors, 1935. (Note: In connection with the revised lists, 1935 there was an additional expenditure of \$13,775.36 paid by the dominion franchise commissioner for proof-reading the lists).

3. \$127,074.93 (For voters' lists and regular work).

4. The number of linotype operators actually engaged on voters' lists work varied from hour to hour and day to day. (a) \$40 per week of 44 hours, less 10 per cent during the fiscal year 1934-35 and 5 per cent during the fiscal year 1935-36, as provided by the Salary Deduction (Continuance) Acts of 1934 and 1935. (b) 8,555.5 hours. Overtime rates authorized by order in council P.C. 417-487 of March 1, 1929, as follows: "The rate of pay for the first three hours after regular quitting time shall be time and a half, then double time; all overtime work after 10 p.m. double time rate; for Sundays double time rate; for statutory and proclaimed holidays double time rate after what would normally be regular working hours." (c) Yes.

5. No.

(a) and (b) answered by above.

6. Yes, 12 new linotype machines were obtained in replacement of a similar number of machines which had been in use from 15 to 23 years and which had become obsolete. These latter machines are operated from time to time as pressure of work requires.

7. The cost of the formation of the basic lists in 1934 was:

Paid to the printing bureau for  
printing the list of electors. . . \$249,561 80  
Salaries to proof-readers. . . . . 38,804 05

The cost of the revision of the lists in 1935 is covered in the answer to question (2).

#### CUSTOMS SEIZURES

Mr. HEAPS:

1. What was the total value of the goods seized by custom officials in Canada during 1935?

2. What are the classifications or nature of goods so seized?

3. What was the valuation of seized goods sold, and what amount was realized?

4. What was the valuation and nature of goods destroyed?

Mr. ILSLEY: I would ask my hon. friend if he would not withdraw this question in view of the fact that it would take so much labour to compile the answers. If he insists I will ask that the question stand as an order for return, but it may not be brought down this session.

Mr. HEAPS: I have no desire to put the department to all the labour entailed in answering the question. If it involves too much work, as the minister suggests, I will drop the question, but I do think that if the department were properly organized it would be a very simple matter to have at the end of each year a complete tabulation of the information asked for in my question.

Question dropped.

#### RADIO REFINERIES LIMITED

Mr. MUTCH:

1. Did the Radio Refineries Limited, located at or near Winnipeg, bring into Canada, during the period from 1930 to October, 1935, large quantities of gasoline without paying the duty thereon?

2. If so, why was the duty not collected?

3. If the government discovered that smuggling had occurred, when did such discovery take place and what action did the government take?

4. Did the government lay a criminal charge against the officers and directors of the said company, and, if not, was any reason assigned?

5. Did the government sue the Radio Oil Refineries Limited, in the Court of King's Bench in Manitoba for a large sum of money?

6. If so, how was settlement effected, and for how much?

7. What was the amount for which the government sued the Radio Oil Refineries Limited?

8. Does the present government propose to take action in the matter, and, if so, what action?

Mr. ILSLEY: Part 8 of this question relates to a matter of government policy and it has not been the custom of the government to answer such questions. Apart from that, the question is answered:

1. No—Importations were described as crude petroleum in its natural state but the department held it was not in its natural state.

2. Due to fact that entries were made under wrong tariff classification.

3. The goods were not smuggled. Following investigation it was definitely established to the satisfaction of the department early in 1934 that duty was being evaded and in May, 1934, charges were preferred.

4. No. A claim under the Customs Act for duties short paid and penalties was preferred against the company. It was believed that better results would be obtained in this way than by criminal procedure.

5. Yes.

6. Settlement was effected for \$10,000, through an agent appointed by the Department of Justice.