

Emergency Powers Act

cannot then be made the excuse for going beyond the one-year extension.

In making that observation, Mr. Chairman, I hope no one will think that we on this side of the house are receding one iota from the position we have stoutly taken throughout this debate, that there should not be any extension at all now; that this measure is completely unjustifiable as an extension of those vast powers under present conditions. But so far as the point I am now dealing with is concerned, this rider that has been tacked on to the one-year extension should, in my opinion, be stricken out.

I will so move, Mr. Chairman, or if the government wishes to have someone over there move that Bill No. 279 be amended by striking out all the words in clause 1 thereof after the words "one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four" I shall be content. That would leave the clause confined simply to this extension to May 31, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four.

Mr. Garson: I have listened with a great deal of interest to my hon. friend's remarks, and I think he will agree that all this present bill does is to extend the act for one year more. It is true that provision is made for a method of further extension, but there is no further extension at this time. In order that there should be no doubt as to our bona fides in this matter we are quite prepared to accept the amendment which my hon. friend has suggested; and if my colleague the Minister of Public Works would so move we might have both clauses 1 and 2 of the bill amended accordingly, which would mean that section 4 of the Emergency Powers Act would read:

Sections one to three of this act expire on the thirty-first day of May, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four.

The remainder of the wording would be stricken out. Then in part II clause 2 would read:

Sections 1 to 3 expire on the 31st day of May, 1954.

The remainder of the section would be stricken out.

Mr. Knowles: On that point, since the Minister of Justice has just drawn attention to the fact that in clause 2 the reference to sections 1 to 3 and the 31st day of May, 1954 are in numerals rather than in words, I should like him to explain why it is in numerals in one place and in words in the other.

Mr. Garson: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will recall that at one time we had quite a lengthy colloquy with regard to the method by which the Revised Statutes of Canada are being drafted. The necessity for having part II in this bill arises from the

[Mr. Fleming.]

fact that we have to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada at the same time that we amend the statute, and that in the Revised Statutes of Canada we are adopting the very sensible procedure of using numerals instead of spelling out the numbers in words.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Are these amendments agreed to?

Amendments agreed to.

Sections 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. Knowles: On division.

Bill reported on division.

The Chairman: When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now.

Mr. Knowles: By leave.

Mr. Garson (for Mr. St. Laurent) moved that the bill be read a third time.

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, very briefly on this motion for third reading I wish to set forth, not by way of restatement but rather of re-emphasis, the reasons for our opposition to this measure. The matter has been debated at all stages, and I have no wish to repeat the very sound and numerous arguments advanced from this side of the house against the measure.

Nothing the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) said this afternoon removed any of the objections to the bill. Undoubtedly he was at his soothing best in his speech this afternoon. Unlike the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson), in the contributions he made to the debate at various stages, the Prime Minister appeared to be seeking to avoid being provocative. I believe he did his best to make the house feel that this was not a very serious matter, and that hon. members should be content to put their full trust in the government.

We are not prepared to legislate on trust after that fashion. In the first place we say there exists today no such emergency as justifies either the invoking of the powers set out in the War Measures Act or the extension of the very wide and virtually absolute powers conferred by this bill upon the governor in council.

This afternoon the Minister of Justice was at pains, in a repetition of an attempt put forward frequently, and always in futility, to make it appear that, after all, the measure is not so very sweeping. Well, I simply leave