

reasonable prices? This paragraph is a denial of the rights of British citizenship and it is asked for and placed in a measure introduced by a government which has said over and over again that irrespective of one's racial origin British citizenship means something. Instead of the government bringing in a bill to revoke British citizenship, it brings it in by the back door by giving power to the governor in council to deport anybody, no matter how many generations he may have lived in this country. Sir, there is more in this paragraph (g) than the principle to which the hon. Minister of Justice referred.

And then finally:

(h) imposition and recovery, in connection with any scheme of control contained in or authorized by orders and regulations, of charges payable to the Receiver General of Canada or into such fund or account as may be ordered.

There may be an explanation of that. But it is a comprehensive section of this bill which the government asks parliament to approve. I shall refer later to some other sections of the bill, which in effect would constitute an abnegation by parliament of its rights.

I said at the beginning that I accept the need for certain controls. But why is the government, in taking this means of continuing these controls, adding powers which by no stretch of the imagination are capable of being used for the purposes indicated by the minister in his speech? In moving the second reading of the bill the minister on behalf of the government is asking us to say that there is a national emergency. Here let me refer for a moment to the declaration of the committee of the Canadian Bar association, which the minister quoted with approval. Let me quote one part of it with approval—nay, all of it, in fact:

Let them face the issue directly and submit to parliament a new law affirming the existence or the apprehension and determining the exact nature of the new emergency.

I ask the minister, when he replies, to tell us where in the speech he delivered he determined the exact emergency that requires the vesting in the governor in council of control over production, manufacture, trading, exportation and importation; transportation by air, road, rail or water; appropriation, control, forfeiture and disposition of property; entry into Canada, exclusion and deportation, and revocation of nationality.

We accept the principle of the need of some controls being continued as enunciated by the minister; we accept it with approval. But we say to the government, bring in your bill defining in precise terms what the nature of the control is to be, and in respect of what

matters. I realize that in a time of war it is axiomatic that the survival of the state is paramount; the continuance of democratic symbolism is of lesser importance. But I also say this, that subject to the immediate needs and necessities which should be determined and placed before parliament, unnecessary abridgments of undemocratic rights must end with the return of peace.

This bill is epoch making. If it become law it makes the governor in council all-powerful for a period of one year, without regard to the desires of parliament. Sir, parliament has been a casualty of this war, and it must not remain so. Under the proposals contained in this bill as drafted the only right which parliament will possess will be the right to determine supply. It not only grants to the governor in council the powers to which I have referred, but it gives the governor in council power to delegate them to someone else. In support of that contention I refer to section 3, subsection (1):

The governor in council may do and authorize such acts and things, and make from time to time such orders and regulations, as he may by reason of the existence—

The authority for delegation is contained in the words, "and authorize such acts and things." Parliament will be supplanted for one year, and the bureaucracy which this country has built up during the period of the war is perpetuated.

Look at the powers asked for. The minister would not let members look at them; we are just to look at the preamble and then we are to vote on a question of principle. I say to you, sir, without fear of contradiction that section 3, coupled with the preamble, contains a comprehensive and all-inclusive dictionary of the powers which were or could have been in the contemplation of the draftsman. There is not a field of economic welfare, not a field of business, not a field of life itself in all its ramifications that the governor in council will not have absolute power over, as will those to whom he will delegate the power. It goes beyond anything suggested in the speech from the throne of September 6, the words of which, I repeat, are these:

You will be asked to approve a measure to extend certain specified emergency powers to meet emergency conditions in the period of reconstruction.

Is this emergency such that there is no power under the sun which the government will not need?

The governor general in his speech said "certain specified powers". The government introduces a bill with no specification, but simply an enunciation of all the powers which