

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

I think discussion amongst representatives of the three parties is the best way to handle this question. The Prime Minister said a few moments ago that he would not make any suggestion to the opposition parties, yet only one or two minutes later he said that if the house leader had not made this suggestion he would make it now. I think, rather than doing this by public discussion or public debate, we should return to the position the Prime Minister spoke of, where there have been conversations—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think what the hon. member is saying is correct, that in the absence of agreement which would lead to unanimous consent we might better not discuss this matter in the house at any length.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** The Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Argue:** Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet. I had not concluded my question of privilege. I am entitled as a member of this house to complete my question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member has a question of privilege will he please raise it.

**Mr. Argue:** Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is very clear. It is that the Prime Minister has made a statement that involved a representative of this group, and I was the person to whom he was referring. The Prime Minister said that the house leader had made a proposal or a suggestion to this group. My question of privilege is that no such suggestion was made to this group.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege I think I should also say to the house in answer to what the Prime Minister said—and I shook my head when he put the question to me—that there was never any proposal put to me at any time by the house leader to the effect that the debate should be continued on Monday. On the contrary, what we were asked—and I say this in all deference to the house leader who is not here—was whether we wanted a two-day debate, and my answer was simply that it should be up to the government to tell us whether a vote was required, and the Prime Minister has answered my question in that respect.

ATOMIC ENERGY—REQUEST FOR EARLY ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. L. B. Pearson (Leader of the Opposition):** I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will consider discussing with the house leader the possibility of making arrangements to move at the earliest possible moment the motion setting up a select committee to consider the policy, operations

[Mr. Argue.]

and expenditures of the national research council, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited, so the question of the future of the uranium industry, which is of such national importance, as well as one involving grave local emergencies, can be fully discussed at an early date.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister):** I think the committee in question, if the house agrees, should be convened at the earliest possible date.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

BRITISH COLUMBIA—STATEMENT ON REPORTED INTIMIDATION OF UNION OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. E. D. Fulton (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, on February 10 the hon. member for Vancouver South asked me if I had received a communication from the national association of marine engineers requesting the Department of Justice to investigate S.I.U. activities. At that time I answered that no such communication had come to my attention.

I have since discovered that a telegram to that effect was received, and that it had been referred to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for comment. Nevertheless my answer remains the same as that given on February 10, which was to the effect that the responsibility for dealing with any alleged cases of attack or intimidation by S.I.U. elements in Vancouver is primarily that of the local law enforcement agency.

MONTREAL—STATEMENT ON DELAYED ACTION BY R.C.M.P. ON SEARCH WARRANTS

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. E. D. Fulton (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might also be permitted to answer a question by the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont, also asked on February 10. The hon. member asked me whether I could explain to the house why the search warrants authorized by the court on December 31, 1959, with regard to the Jacques Cartier bridge collectors were not acted upon by the R.C.M.P. before February 6, 1960.

After inquiry, I must reply to the hon. member that his information is incorrect. The first search warrants in this matter were issued on February 4. The majority of them, some 25, were executed the next day, February 5. The others were executed between February 6 and 9, and the delay in these latter cases was because of the fact that the persons mentioned in the warrants were not living at that time at their former residences.