

Supply—Justice

On November 6, 1959, another man was beaten up and again under the section headed "Action taken if any" it says, "Wife called police. No mention of police action." Mr. Justice Norris has said that the evidence did not clearly indicate that the officers of the S.I.U. were responsible, but one thing the victims all had in common is that they were opposed to the S.I.U.

I appeal to the minister tonight to get on with the job of enforcing the law of the land so that our citizens can be freed from the kind of intimidation which has been so pronounced over the last months and years.

[Translation]

Mr. Gregoire: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) announced early this evening that there would now be a board of appeal for persons who have or may have access to secret documents to enable them to justify themselves, should circumstances require them to do so, and to allow the government to make sure that its employees, in departments where secret documents do exist, are reliable. In my opinion, the setting up of that board of appeal is a most commendable thing.

Be that as it may, I feel that, this evening, we have more important things to discuss concerning the estimates put forth by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chevrier).

At noon, on the orders of the day, some questions were asked but, unfortunately, the few answers given were vague, even evasive. The matter is either being examined or else there is nothing to reply.

A while ago, the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) spoke about seamen who were being threatened by some labour leaders.

It is now my turn and I would like to talk about a very serious problem, that of an international trust that managed to make the price of sugar rise even though there is no shortage—

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I should not want to stop the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gregoire) from making his remarks on the estimates of the Department of Justice but I feel that he should speak on the statement made by the Prime Minister.

The hon. member is dealing with item number one of the department's estimates, which is contrary to the rules since members of the official opposition have the privilege of being first to express their criticism. It is only out of courtesy that we did not interrupt the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) a few minutes ago.

Since members of the official opposition have precedence, I feel the hon. member for

[Mr. Olson.]

Lapointe should postpone until later on his remarks on the estimates of the Department of Justice.

The Chairman: I think that the hon. member for Lapointe may proceed with his remarks along those lines. Since we are considering the first item of the estimates of the justice department, he is entitled to keep on discussing the point he raised and which is actually related to the estimates of that department.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I refer again to the point of order, because I understand that the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) had already intimated that he wanted to speak on the estimates of the Department of Justice. You reversed the order of priority earlier and by courtesy we did not object when the hon. member for Greenwood took the floor, but he was supposed to confine himself to the criticism of the estimates of the justice department, instead of commenting some other point or the statement of the Prime Minister and of his colleague, the Minister of Justice. We did not deem it necessary then to create a precedent to the effect that the official opposition should yield to another party of the opposition which has priority over the party represented by the hon. member for Lapointe. I therefore suggest that the member for Bow River be recognized.

The Chairman: I did not make any agreement with a party to the effect that the comments of each member would be strictly limited to the point raised by the Prime Minister. I therefore suggest, once again, that the hon. member for Lapointe is in order and he may go on.

Mr. Gregoire: Mr. Chairman, I was talking about a problem which has again been raised lately, that is, the increase in the price of sugar.

Obviously, one may ask what this has to do with the estimates of the Department of Justice. However, I believe that it can easily be related to the problem in question because, in my opinion, the whole matter of the increase in the price of sugar rests on the fact that the Department of Justice tolerates at this moment a combine of a number of companies which fix the prices in spite of normal trade practices.

There lies on the part of certain concerns an infringement due to the fact that there is no competition, as it were, in the sugar trade, and that Canada, like many other countries in the world, when it comes to certain commodities, sticks to regular suppliers and remains a faithful member of the London Sugar Exchange without even calling for tenders on the world markets.