

Motions for Papers

Mr. McCubbin:

1. No.
2. See answer to No. 1.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS PURCHASES

Mr. Knowles:

What was the dollar value of purchases made by the Canadian National Railways, during each of the last three years (either fiscal or calendar), from (a) Montreal Bronze Limited; (b) Monsarrat Machinery and Foundries Limited; (c) Smiths Falls Malleable Casting Company; (d) Dominion Brake Shoe Company Limited; (e) Canadian Car and Foundry Company, Limited; (f) Dominion Wheel and Foundries Limited; (g) Montreal Locomotive Works Limited?

Mr. Langlois (Gaspé):

The Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

It is not the policy of the company to divulge the nature and details of contracts or orders between the railway and other parties for the supply of materials required for company use.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

THE RIOT ACT, ETC.

Mr. Knowles:

1. How many (a) charges; (b) convictions; (c) acquittals; (d) charges not proceeded with, have there been in Canada between January 1, 1919 and January 1, 1954, under sections 89, 90, 92, 94, 95, 96 and 97 of the Criminal Code, chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, or their predecessors if the section numbers in question have been altered during that period?

2. What was the "style of cause" in each conviction noted above?

3. How many times has the Riot Act been read in Canada between January 1, 1919 and January 1, 1954?

4. What official (sheriff, deputy sheriff, mayor or other head officer, or justice) was responsible for each such reading, and what official read it in each such case?

5. How many times during the above period has the Riot Act been read in connection with a labour dispute, and when and where did such readings take place?

6. Has the Riot Act been read in Canada at any time since January 1, 1954? If so, when and where?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

P.F.R.A. OFFICIALS' EXPENSE ACCOUNTS

Mr. Diefenbaker:

For a copy of the expense accounts amounting to the sums of \$2,794.23, \$3,416.13, \$2,811.88, \$2,534.63, \$3,356.84, \$2,791.51, \$2,609.78, \$2,318.64, \$2,644.07, \$2,447.85, \$2,416.88, which according to return No. 10B, tabled on June 1, 1954, represented the respective expense accounts for the year 1953 of the following officers or employees of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act administration, namely: (a) Mr. H. C. Biddell; (b) Mr. E. H. Butterfield; (c) Mr. J. H. Graham; (d) Mr. W. H. Gillis; (e) Mr. M. Hunka; (f) Mr. B. B. Kenny; (g) Mr. M. R. Skelton; (h) Dr. L. B. Thomson; (i) Mr. D. L. Barlow; (j) Mr. Adam Lyon; (k) Mr. J. L. Smith.

P.F.A.A. OFFICIALS' EXPENSE ACCOUNTS

Mr. Diefenbaker:

For a copy of the expense accounts amounting to the sums of \$3,424.96, \$3,298.38, \$3,075.10, and \$3,023.86, which according to return of No. 9F, tabled on June 1, 1954, represented the respective expense accounts for the year 1953 of the following officers or employees of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act administration, namely: (a) Mr. F. Carpenter; (b) Mr. J. H. Mitchell; (c) Mr. E. Zahorski; (d) Mr. A. A. Brown.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING POLICING, HARBOUR TOLLS, ETC.

Hon. Stuart S. Garson (for the Minister of Transport) moved the third reading of Bill No. 421, to amend the National Harbours Board Act.

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion agreed to?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

POST OFFICE ACT

ENLARGEMENT OF PROVISION RESPECTING DISTRIBUTION OF NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (for the Postmaster General) moved the third reading of Bill No. 473, to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion agreed to?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before this motion for third reading is put, there are a few words I wish to say. Yesterday we made clear by our vote on second reading that we are opposed to this bill. It is therefore not necessary for me to say much on this motion for third reading. However, on checking my files in connection with this matter, in which I have certain correspondence with persons who were interested in seeing this bill go through, I find that, when I spoke on second reading yesterday, I used one figure which was not quite correct. As a matter of fact, from my point of view, the situation is even a little bit worse than that which would be indicated by the figures I used. When I spoke on second reading yesterday I indicated that the saving in trucking costs to *Maclean's* magazine resulting from the passage of this bill would be of the order of \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year. I was then speaking from memory. On checking the correspondence that I have in this matter I now find that the saving to *Maclean's* magazine from the passing of this bill will be something over \$36,000 a year. That is *Maclean's* stake in this measure. That is the amount it is now costing that