

some for pleasure purposes. I disagree; these people do not want it for pleasure purposes. The farmers go with light delivery trucks. A business man, in my section who is not even a British subject has two large cars. He has a class C ration book for one car and a class A ration book for the other. That is not cooperation; it is not setting the proper example. These things need to be checked up. I do not know anything about the experience of the controller, but I know this is distinctly not in the national interest throughout our part of the country.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not understand the statement made by the minister when speaking of the farmers who were affected by the orders made by the commissioner or whatever his title may be. The minister says it is always the way, that the people who say that they are ahead of the government, when an order is made raise complaints. That is a very unfair statement.

Mr. ILSLEY: Of course I did not say it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is that not the meaning of what the minister said?

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, reading *Hansard* will reveal whether or not that is a correct interpretation to place upon the words he uttered. There is no question of objection to regimentation where necessary. The objection we have taken here regularly has been this: Parliament is sitting; yet you have controllers and heads of boards and all these other individuals making laws affecting, not the war effort, but the individual lives of the people of Canada engaged in civilian operations. Against unfair orders there is no recourse to parliament. We talk about parliament losing prestige. No one was more definite about that than the Minister of Finance the other day. He spoke of the falling away of parliament's authority. He gave his reasons for it. In large measure, its loss of prestige is due to the fact that parliament is abdicating its power in favour of boards and commissions which act without regard to circumstances and conditions and who refuse, when arbitrary rulings are pointed out to them, to make any change. Seventy-five per cent of the laws affecting individuals in Canada to-day are passed by commissions, boards and like bodies and not by parliament. I heard it said only yesterday, that we had better not object in regard to certain orders made by the oil controller for if, as members of parliament, we do so we shall find that he will become stubborn in regard to changing objectionable orders that are now in effect.

Mr. ILSLEY: Who said this?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I said I heard it said yesterday. The minister has taken the position that he does not know how the order came to be made; he does not know who made it; and he accepted the statement of the hon. member for Souris that it must have been made by some commissioner.

Mr. ILSLEY: The services administrator.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The minister said, as I understood him, that it was made for the purpose of assisting in winning the war by the conservation of gasoline. Then I ask him, what reason was there in the order made in Regina the other day in the case of a farmer whose letter I am prepared to place on record if it is required, in which he informs me that a farmer was advised that if he disposed of his truck and bought a second-hand car, then the order would not apply, and he could operate it and secure gasoline under the regulations, but because of the fact that he has only a truck he is denied the right that he would possess if he owned a motor car. Surely this is unreasonable. It is just an example of bureaucracy at its worst.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know, but I think the reason would be this, that if a man gets a commercial category he is supposed to use the gasoline for commercial purposes. If he gets a pleasure category he may use the gasoline for pleasure purposes, up to the limit of that category. I should think that would be the basis for the rule.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: But still that does not answer the situation of thousands and thousands of farmers all over western Canada, and no doubt all over Canada, whose sole means of transportation is by truck, which they use for both purposes.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. gentleman wanted to know the reason.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I can understand the reason stated by the minister; that is true enough, but it is just an example of bureaucracy at its worst, in that the controller makes regulations which parliament does not have an opportunity to look into and which work discrimination. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the minister will give the assurance that this matter will be looked into and that where there is any unfairness or discrimination it will be removed, as far as that is practicable.

Mr. ILSLEY: I can give that assurance; that is fair enough. The matter will be looked into, and in so far as there is discrimination that it is practicable to remove, it will be removed.