

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

RAILWAYS, AIR LINES AND SHIPPING REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS AND BUDGETS TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, by leave I beg to move:

That the annual report for 1962 of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian National Railways securities trust, the auditor's report to parliament for 1962 in respect of the Canadian National Railways, the budget for 1963 of the Canadian National Railways, the annual report of Trans-Canada Air Lines for 1962, the auditor's report to parliament for 1962 in respect of Trans-Canada Air Lines, and the budget for 1963 of Trans-Canada Air Lines, tabled on May 17, 1963, be referred to the sessional committee on railways, air lines and shipping.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, on this motion I want to ask the minister a question. Could he give us an explanation as to what we are going to do about the 1961 reports, which as far as I know have not been dealt with by the house?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware they had not been dealt with by the house. If they have not been dealt with, I am afraid it happened before my time. However, I will look into the matter.

Motion agreed to.

[Later:]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. McIlraith: Earlier today the hon. member for Port Arthur asked me when the annual reports of Canadian National Railways and Trans-Canada Air Lines for 1961 will receive consideration. I find on checking the records that they were considered by the sessional committee in November of 1962 and were approved by that committee, as to Canadian National Railways on November 23, 1962, and as to Trans-Canada Air Lines on November 27, 1962.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FRANK L. BANFIELD, HALIFAX—PROCEEDINGS UNDER PAROLE ACT

Question No. 1,150—Mr. MacEwan:

1. Was Frank Leonard Banfield of Halifax released from Dorchester penitentiary in November, 1962

and, if so, was he given a certificate of expiry of sentence?

2. Was Mr. Banfield subsequently arrested by the R.C.M.P. on the 11th of June, 1963, at his place of employment by exercise of a warrant of committal under the Parole Act and if so, was he lodged in the county jail at Halifax and, for what period of time?

3. Were the R.C.M.P. and the national parole board aware that Mr. Banfield (a) had resided (b) been steadily employed in Halifax since his release from Dorchester and (c) been married since his release?

4. Was a warrant of committal issued by a provincial magistrate as required by the Parole Act and, if so, what is the name, and the status, of the person who signed the warrant of committal?

Mr. Chevrier: 1. Frank Leonard Banfield was released from Dorchester penitentiary in November, 1962, and was given a document that certified that he had been incarcerated in the institution serving a term of two years. In addition, the document stated that he had been sentenced on May 10, 1961, and was released on expiry on the 23rd day of November, 1962, after serving one year, six months and 14 days.

2. Mr. Banfield was subsequently arrested by the R.C.M. Police on June 11, 1963, at his place of employment and lodged in the county jail at Halifax after 12.30 p.m. on June 11, 1963 and was released on bail during the morning of June 14, 1963.

3. No.

4. When Mr. Banfield was arrested as described in paragraph 2, the R.C.M. Police had in their possession a forfeiture warrant of committal, purporting to be under the Parole Act, which has not been issued by a magistrate as required by that act. On June 24, 1963 a substitute forfeiture warrant of committal was issued by provincial magistrate Horace E. Dickey, Q.C. at Halifax, Nova Scotia but immediately thereafter and before such warrant was executed a new certificate of parole was issued to Mr. Banfield.

PROSECUTIONS OF COMPANIES FOLLOWING NORRIS REPORT

Question No. 1,170—Mr. Orlikow:

1. Is the government considering legal action against Canada Steamship Lines; The Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Co.; David Transportation Ltd.; Guy Tombs Marine Services Ltd.; National Sand and Material Co., Ltd.; Northwest Steamship Ltd.; N. M. Paterson & Sons Ltd.; Quebec and Ontario Transportation Co. Ltd.; Quebec Paper Sales & Transportation Co., Ltd.; The Roach Steamship Co. Ltd. concerning agreements signed by these companies with the S.I.U. which were declared by Justice Norris to be in contravention of the provisions of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act; if not, for what reason?