

Supply—Justice

Mr. Woolliams: I wish to thank the hon. member for Peace River and I hope that I am not being rude in asking for the floor. Yesterday, of course, we had two statements. We had a statement from the Minister of Justice and then we had a statement from the Prime Minister. I dealt yesterday particularly with the statement made by the Prime Minister. It did seem rather unusual that at the opening of discussion on these estimates we would have two statements, one from the Minister of Justice and one from the Prime Minister, and particularly that the Prime Minister should make a statement on these estimates.

We have dealt at some length with the Spencer case and I should now like to make a few general remarks with reference to the estimates. The first question has been answered with reference to the division of the department. We accept this fact but it has been somewhat difficult to determine who has jurisdiction over what. It does seem that under the present administration there has been, as I have already made reference, some divisive confusion about jurisdiction within the Department of Justice. I would hope that the minister will make a clear statement in that regard.

I would also say this. I wonder whether these hon. gentlemen have ever considered, since they feel there has to be legislation passed in order to set up the divisions, whether they really have the jurisdiction over certain matters which they claim to have. We would like to hear from the ministers, whether it be the Minister of Justice or the President of the Privy Council, under whose jurisdiction the administration of federal offences falls. I assume it would be the Minister of Justice. We should like to know also under whose jurisdiction the following items fall: National Parole Board, bankruptcy—I am going to have something to say about that in a few minutes—penitentiaries, the committee report on juvenile delinquency as well as the whole question of young offenders, and the Combines Investigation Act.

● (4:00 p.m.)

No one would underestimate the importance of the administration of justice. After all, the tentacles of justice must stretch into all federal departments to obtain good, sound, honest government with equitable administration.

Co-ordination has always been the important thing so far as I am concerned in the administration of justice. What we have in

[Mr. Baldwin.]

this administration, I repeat, is no co-ordination at all. What we have is divisive confusion. We on this side of the house do not know, parliament does not know, I do not think the government knows, nor do the people of Canada know, who is really Minister of Justice. As I say, there is divisive confusion. I have come to the conclusion that the Prime Minister, and I say this with respect, has run out of talent and is somewhat concerned, when he assigns a certain portfolio to a minister, whether he has confidence in him.

I used an illustration yesterday which I am going to use today, namely, the Canadian Wheat Board. This is an analogy which I shall come back to in so far as the Department of Justice is concerned. For years the Canadian Wheat Board was under the jurisdiction either of the Minister of Agriculture or of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. When the Prime Minister had to look for a new Minister of Agriculture and when he appointed a new Minister of Trade and Commerce he must have looked at both of them and said to himself: Neither of you has any administrative ability so far as the Wheat Board is concerned so I will leave that with the new Minister of Finance because he is the only man who seems to know anything about it.

Exactly the same sort of thing has happened with the Department of Justice. The Prime Minister probably said to himself: The Minister of Justice is a fine fellow but I do not know whether he can handle this or that phase. As a result, Mr. Chairman, we have divisive confusion and we cannot get any answers at all.

Yesterday I asked a question—this is an example of divisive confusion and it is why the Speaker and I seem to be at odds—which was ruled out of order by the Speaker. I knew I would be in difficulty when I asked another question today. But if there is a matter of importance in the nation today it is the question of crime, crime in high places and crime in other places. Its tentacles are creeping all through our society. I have heard the leader of our party and the hon. member for Yukon both say on many occasions something with which I am in full accord, that we should have an investigation into crime in this nation. A royal commission should be set up.

We have just heard the hon. member for Lapointe talk about the Marcoux investigation. During the election Dr. Marcoux alleged that six members of the Creditistes had said