

Combines Investigation Act

Green	Murphy
Hansell	Noseworthy
Harkness	Pearkes
Harris (Danforth)	Poulin
Hatfield	Quelch
Herridge	Shaw
Hodgson	Smith (Calgary West)
Homuth	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Johnston	Thatcher
Jones	Tustin
Knight	White (Hastings- Peterborough)
Knowles	White (Middlesex East)
Lennard	Wright
Low	Wylie—56.
MacInnis	
McLure	

the enforcement of the Combines Investigation Act and the related legislation contained in section 498 of the Criminal Code.

I think it is appropriate at this moment for me to emphasize the fact that it is indeed one of the duties of the Minister of Justice to see that the laws of this land are obeyed. In line with that duty it is appropriate that if he discovers any act under his administration to be not adequate for its enforcement, he should at some stage bring to the house a bill rectifying those shortcomings.

Chapter 106 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, is an act respecting the Department of Justice. The duties of the Minister of Justice are set out in section four, and I should like to quote the first two paragraphs of that section as follows:

The Minister of Justice shall
(a) be the official legal adviser of the governor general—

Note that that is the governor general, not the governor in council. The minister, as has been said so often by the member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), is the keeper of the king's conscience. To continue:

—and the legal member of His Majesty's privy council for Canada;

(b) see that the administration of public affairs is in accordance with law;

As I have said, it is proper and appropriate for the Minister of Justice, when he finds that a statute under his jurisdiction is deficient in such a way as to make it difficult for him adequately to enforce it, to bring before parliament a bill that would seek to correct those shortcomings. However, in the light of the circumstances connected with the introduction of this measure—I am referring now solely to such circumstances as were known to all of us before the minister made his speech yesterday, and I shall not, sir, transgress your ruling; I will not try to discuss what the minister said yesterday, despite what I may think about the ruling—in the light of the circumstances that were known to us before that pitiful defence was made yesterday, the action of the minister in bringing Bill 144 before the house at this time is an affront to this parliament.

When was the notice given for the introduction of Bill No. 144? As will be seen from *Votes and Proceedings*, it was given just before the deadline of six o'clock on Wednesday, November 2. What had happened on Wednesday, November 2? At three o'clock that afternoon two questions were asked on the orders of the day, one by my leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), and the other by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar wanted to know if there was in existence a report from the

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has the floor.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I was on my feet when the point of order was raised. Do I lose my place because I sat down?

Mr. Pouliot: I rise to a point of order—

Mr. Ferguson: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Pouliot: The hon. gentleman—and when I say “gentleman” I refer to the hon. member for Lake Centre—has spoken already on the second reading and has moved an amendment. He can speak only once at that stage of the bill. While I regret that the standing order will not permit me the pleasure of listening to him speak once more on the same matter, I submit that the floor should be given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Speaker: According to the procedure followed in the house when an hon. member makes a motion, sits down, hands the written motion to the Speaker, as happened in this case, and the Speaker reads the motion, the member cannot speak again to the question. I call on the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) for the second reading of Bill No. 144 to amend the Combines Investigation Act. The first sentence in the explanatory notes to the minister's bill reads:

The amendments provided in this bill are designed to facilitate enforcement of the Combines Investigation Act, and of related Criminal Code provisions.

When the Minister of Justice introduced the bill on November 4 he opened with remarks which were substantially the same as those contained in the explanatory notes from which I have just quoted. As reported on page 1439 of *Hansard*, he said:

This bill is designed to carry into effect three recommendations of the combines investigation commissioner which are designed to strengthen