with the company. That has been stated before. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is saying what he is saying in good faith, but it does not happen to be true.

Mr. Regier: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that you will agree that the hon. member who has the floor is listing the record of the attorney general for the province of Newfoundland who is in charge of the law enforcement officers in Newfoundland, according to the words of our own minister in this house. The hon. member has the right to place on the record whatever he deems appropriate to place there, regardless of any added information which the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate may have.

Mr. Pickersgill: May I ask the hon. member whether that is the current number?

Mr. Peters: It is the one I obtained from the table. I did not know that the attorney general had resigned from this position. I did not know that the province of Newfoundland owned part of this particular company.

Mr. Pickersgill: They had a loan.

Mr. Peters: They may own both of them for all I know. But even if this is true, I still maintain that he has some ulterior interest or has had and that he cannot be an impartial judge of whether the interests of law enforcement, as far as the mounted police are concerned, is best served in this particular way.

The minister may know whether this Inspector Argent is fully trained and is considered to be competent by the standards or requirements that are necessary now under the training that is given to the R.C.M.P. I understand that his training certainly does not do anything for promoting harmony in the tense situation that prevailed in the province of Newfoundland. If he was trained as most of the R.C.M.P., that I know of have been trained, he does not show it. They are very diplomatic. They do not make the mistakes that this gentleman has been credited with making. I refer only to the situation that happened when a large number of people or strikers were jailed and when their wives were trying to take them food. This particular inspector would not allow them to take in the food. It was only at the insistence of the president of district 2 of the union that this food was allowed to come in and a riot was prevented. The women were going to riot. I do not think the R.C.M.P. in that province, including those people who were brought in from the rangers, would have been ready to put up a defence, if you call it that, against the women who were of order, the hon. member is now embarking

Supply-Justice

trying to supply their husbands with food which they understood was badly needed.

I therefore think that some of the responsibility rests on the minister to have an investigation into this situation. I am in complete agreement with the minister that he has the right to make these decisions without the commissioner resigning or the commissioner having the right to say, "Either you do it this way or I will resign". I think the minister took the only position that could be taken in that case. I think that was another matter altogether. But I think an obligation is owed to the name of the R.C.M.P. to clear up some of these statements; and the clearing up of them is not going to come from having the superintendent in that province tell the minister what the situation is or from having the inspector tell the superintendent so the superintendent can tell the minister what the situation is. An investigation is necessary.

Some correction must be made in the arrangements that we make with the province so that we do not get into this kind of a fuss where our national police force is being used to break strikes and to act as strikebreakers and to act as rowdies to promote violence itself. The fact that there has been very little violence since the police were not assured that they were going to get reinforcements in order to put on a show; and because they did not get those reinforcements there has been very little trouble because, I would suggest, the mounted police are not so cocky. There are not 66 of them marching along clubbing everything they see in the way, knocking down women and doing the other things that are alleged in this particular statement. The only way in which that I and, I think the rest of Canada, can be sure that this is not done is for an investigation to take place.

Mr. Chairman, I think if this were only an isolated case, if I could say it is confined only to the province of Newfoundland then I am not to pleased with the way justice operates in that particular province. I disagree with the former speaker who said that in his opinion the law is that the union was only decertified, not that it could not operate there any more; that the company involved would now be able to deal with a number of unions. The certification did not say that. The certification said that the number of people in the bargaining unit for that company had decided by vote that they were going to be given that jurisdiction, and they were given that jurisdiction. It does not mean that four or five unions-

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, on a point

66968-9-325