

alone is capable of promoting a first-class debate on discrimination and kindred acts of intolerance so repulsive to a British democracy; but I say that the powers sought in this paragraph are entirely unnecessary. Why should the ministry wish to include powers which they already have by virtue of laws now on the statute book and duly passed by this parliament? The minister in charge of immigration has full power under, I believe, section 4 of the act to admit into Canada anyone as he deems fit; he has also the power of exclusion and deportation; and as far as revocation of nationality is concerned, this is fully covered by the new citizenship bill at present before parliament.

We shall also take objection to the wording of subsection 4 of section 3 of the bill before us, and already referred to by the previous speaker. This subsection reads as follows:

Every order in council made under this act shall be laid before parliament as soon as may be after it is made.

The principle enunciated in this subsection is a good one, but the wording is too vague, and it is only to make it more specific that we intend to introduce an amendment to this subsection to provide for the orders in council to be laid before parliament within a specified time, and, if parliament is not in session, that these orders in council be published in the *Canada Gazette* immediately, so that all members of parliament may at once be cognizant of these laws passed by orders in council. Parliament should also assert its supremacy by retaining the power to annul such orders in council. There is nothing new or revolutionary in the amendment which we are going to propose. Other acts of parliament of Canada as well as of Great Britain contain these provisions, and I think that if parliament is willing to grant to the ministry these extraordinary powers of legislation, they will not object to a clause which will assert the supremacy of parliament, which is the fundamental principle of the whole of our constitutional law.

I am occupying only a few minutes, because I think the bill ought to be passed, that we ought to "make time"; and we believe that it should receive second reading without undue delay, that the principle should be endorsed, and that such amendments should be made in committee along the lines which I have indicated.

Mr. SOLON E. LOW (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I take just a few minutes to place before the house, in a completely objective way, and with the desire to engender more light than heat, a view regarding the legislation which is now before the house.

Bill No. 15 in effect extends the life of the War Measures Act for another year, on the assumption that it is advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada. I hope every hon. member is perfectly clear as to the implication of the whole bill and as to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his colleagues of the cabinet are asking them—asking them, I say, as the accredited representatives of the people and the custodians of democracy in Canada—to do by approving bill No. 15. The cabinet is asking this house to set aside the national constitution, the powers, rights and privileges of parliament, the sovereign authority of the people, and the constitutional autonomous rights of the provinces, so well spoken of by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). In effect, it seems to me, they are asking parliament to abrogate democracy in Canada and to vest complete and absolute power in the Prime Minister and the cabinet.

Now the members of the cabinet are asking parliament to confer upon them the power to do and authorize such acts and things and to make from time to time such orders and regulations as they may deem necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada. Under these absolute powers any order and/or regulation issued with the approval of the cabinet by some self-opinionated bureaucrat with an inflated idea of his own self-importance is to have all the force of law.

In addition to these absolute powers, and evidently to avoid the odium of having to enact orders that have the force of law for the purpose of suppressing free speech, criticism of government policies, and the general system of regimentation introduced during the war period, the government is asking parliament to approve and authorize the continuation of all those war-time measures which marked our decline into the totalitarian state while our men were fighting totalitarianism on the battlefronts of the world.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the substance of the bill. Sometimes, I find, it is good for all of us to take a straight look at the whole ugly picture. I put it very bluntly, I know. But I ask now that hon. members will answer this within themselves: Could Hitler or any other dictator with whom the world has been afflicted during these disastrous years of human history have asked for more complete and absolute power? What could not be included in the power to "do and authorize such acts and things and make from time to time such orders and regulations" as officials of government may deem it necessary? Incidentally, it appears that the cabinet seeks the power, as