

*Supply—Justice*

I turn now to another extremely important matter that is facing Canada today. First, we can all agree that the first duty of the Minister of Justice is to enforce the law and protect the lives of our citizens and give them some measure of freedom from fear. I do not think anyone in this house would be in disagreement on that matter. As a matter of fact, earlier tonight the Prime Minister said we should not allow the undermining of our basic principles. He even said that citizens give the state the direction in enforcing and upholding law. I am not suggesting that these are direct quotations, but I think it is a paraphrasing of some of the things the Prime Minister said tonight. He was referring to things of a political or ideological nature which were unfriendly to Canada in which a person may have been involved.

However, I believe it is equally as bad, and it may even be worse, to allow any organization in Canada, be it a labour union or otherwise to rule by force or intimidation. To suggest, as the Prime Minister has said, that the citizens give the state directions in enforcing and upholding the law, to suggest that the citizens of Canada are prepared to tolerate the intimidation that has gone on in the seamen's union during these past four years, I think is absurd. These weaknesses of law enforcement are today putting Canada and democracy on severe trial to maintain the confidence of our citizens in the maintenance of law and order.

At the outset I want to say that this matter of enforcing the law is not confined to enforcing it on labour unions. Some of the things that have gone on and are documented in the Norris report are matters of encroachment on human rights and liberties. Citizens, whether they be members of a labour union or not, are entitled to protection under the law from such encroachment, and I might mention that this question of enforcement of the law with respect to labour unions is giving some labour unions and their members a black eye which they do not deserve.

There may be what Justice Norris has described as jurisdictional jealousies troubling the Minister of Justice in getting down to the question of enforcing the law. Mr. Justice Norris has this to say at page 312 of his report:

Local police forces are not equipped to deal with mass action by irresponsible persons. All police forces, federal, provincial and municipal should extend their efforts to the utmost in co-operation with each other—avoiding jurisdictional jealousies—to the end that there shall be certainty in the enforcement of the law and that respect for the law will be maintained. It should not be difficult by co-operation between all police forces to reach a common understanding as to action in connection with labour disputes. It might be that police officers should have some special training on labour matters.

If the Minister of Justice has run into this problem, then I think it is his responsibility to look into the matter and come before parliament to introduce what might be called emergency legislation, giving him the power to deal with this mess. Most of us are agreed that it is this intimidation, particularly in the S.I.U., that allowed the situation to develop to the point it reached.

Even today the Minister of Justice suggested, with respect to some men who were beaten up on the train last Monday night, that one of the men involved refused to testify. We must ask ourselves why, and I am sure we are all agreed the reason is that he is scared. He has no confidence that the law will protect him and is afraid to testify, even though he had a severe beating.

Questions were asked repeatedly of the Minister of Justice, as far back as early July, about what he was going to do concerning Justice Norris' recommendations on prosecutions. They are to be found at pages 2234, 2302 and 2303 of *Hansard*. I shall not enumerate all the pages, but on almost every occasion the minister replied that the matter was under investigation and he could say no more at this time. I believe our common law states that if justice is to be done it demands justice without delay, and in this respect the previous ministers of justice are equally guilty, because many of these acts of violence took place when they were in office.

I hope that soon—indeed the day is long past—the minister will find some way to enforce the law and restore confidence in the people that the law will be maintained. If he cannot find anything in the present statutes to enable him to do this, then he should come before parliament and ask for additional power. The action taken respecting this whole mess for the last three or four months can be described as a despicable display of dereliction of duty.

The minister's first responsibility is to enforce the law, and I suggest he has not been doing it. He has not taken all the steps he could have to remove fear and intimidation from the men who have been involved in these things.

Schedule 31, which was published along with the Norris report, quotes 75 cases of what are called, "examples of intimidation and violence." To my knowledge there has not been a single conviction in any of them. For example you find—and I am not going to read this all into the record because hon. members have it in their possession—that on October 24, 1958, a man was beaten up and under the section headed, "Action taken if any," it states "no mention" of any action taken by the law enforcement officers.