

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Argue:** Since I have asked the Minister of Agriculture a question identical to that asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre, except in one particular, would the minister mind saying whether any amendments will be introduced to make the half-township provision apply to all parts?

**Mr. Gardiner:** We brought in an amendment last year which to all intents and purposes, does that.

**Mr. Argue:** No.

**Mr. Gardiner:** We may have a difference of opinion about it, but there is no further amendment on that point.

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**SEA ISLAND, B.C., AIR FORCE STATION—  
EMERGENCY QUARTERS

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. G. R. Pearkes (Nanaimo):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence, notice of which I have sent him. Have instructions been issued by officers of the Department of National Defence to the effect that families of servicemen occupying emergency quarters at the Sea Island, British Columbia, R.C.A.F. station, are to vacate these quarters by April 1? If so, will the minister authorize an extension of the time limit to those who are unable to find other suitable accommodation?

**Hon. Brooke Claxton (Minister of National Defence):** There is no information on this subject available at national defence headquarters. Since receiving notice of the hon. gentleman's question today I have caused inquiries to be made by the R.C.A.F. at Vancouver, and just as soon as information is received I will communicate it to him. If the information indicates the desirability of taking action such as he suggests, that action will be taken.

**COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT**FLOUR MILLING INDUSTRY—OPINION OF COUNSEL  
AS TO PROSECUTION—LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Lake Centre):** I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question arising out of the answer to a question which is to be found at page 1003 of *Hansard*. In that question I asked:

Was a submission made to counsel following delivery to the Minister of Justice on the McGregor report on the milling industry for an opinion to ascertain whether the recommendations were such that proceedings either under the combines act or the Criminal Code should be taken?

And also:

Was a legal opinion secured from the law officers of the crown or other counsel on the question as to whether the limitation of actions provided for in section 1141 of the Criminal Code applied to prosecutions under the combines act?

The answer was yes, and the counsel were named. Will the minister table the replies given by Mr. Kelly and Mr. Phelan?

**Hon. Stuart S. Garson (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend will refer back to *Hansard* he will see that a question almost identical in substance to the one he has just asked was asked by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell). Having received no notice of his question, I am sorry I cannot give him the exact page in *Hansard*. The answer which I gave on that occasion will answer exactly the question which my hon. friend has asked.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I ask the minister this: Instead of filing the submission or the answer given by counsel, will he say whether prosecution was recommended, or whether in their opinion the limitation of actions actually applied?

**Mr. Garson:** If my hon. friend will consult the answer to which I have referred, I think he will find that it is an answer to his present question as well.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** No; far from it.

**Mr. Garson:** If my hon. friend wishes, I have no objection to repeating the substance of the answer, which was to this effect: Upon receipt of the question asked by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart I consulted with the deputy minister of the Department of Justice, who told me it was the first time in his experience that any such question had ever been asked, seeking the production of confidential legal opinions given to officers under the Combines Investigation Act. I also said that I had consulted with the then commissioner, Mr. Fred A. McGregor, and was informed by him that, having regard to the fact these opinions were based upon a consideration of all the evidence and exhibits, which were analysed and examined at very great length, and that since in these opinions the advising counsel indicated the course of actual conduct of the prosecution in these cases, it would be of the greatest value to the defence; and for that reason these opinions had always been regarded as confidential in nature, had never been produced, and, as I indicated before, had never even been asked for.

I might add that we have at the present time three prosecutions under way: one against certain companies in the bread