

*Defence Production Act*

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** It is difficult to imagine what you are trying to prove today.

**Mr. Drew:** I am—

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** You cannot even read the act.

**Mr. Drew:**—in the most courteous manner possible, trying to meet the difficulty expressed by the Minister of Defence Production in these words:

If at this stage anyone knows what the argument against the bill is I am sure that I cannot be one of that number.

I am still trying to explain to the minister what is the argument against the bill.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** Still rolling out words.

**Mr. Drew:** Well, the words do roll out.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** I am sure 75,000 words have rolled out since you started your speech.

**Mr. Drew:** Oh, no, that is an underestimate. This is one of the rare occasions when the minister has not exaggerated figures. But in this particular case the fact is that the argument is necessary if the minister does not know what the objections are. My hope, even at this stage, is that there will be some on the other side who will have the same kind of change of opinion which has been indicated by the press in their examination of this subject.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** Read your ten editors again.

**Mr. Drew:** What was that?

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** The ten editors, I say. We should go back to them; they like you.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, I can hardly hear the Minister of Defence Production.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** Just carry on, then.

**Mr. Drew:** He said something about ten editors and that we should go back to them. I am not exactly sure what that reference means.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** Ask your colleague the hon. member for Greenwood.

**Mr. Drew:** If the minister has only seen ten editorials opposed to the act, then I would suggest his office is less efficient than I had every reason to believe it was. Then we have this statement of the minister as recorded at page 5380 of *Hansard*, and he really tried to give us the creeps. He said:

You may be greatly relieved that those particular situations are behind me. I can say that now we

[Mr. Drew.]

have started on a program of development that gives me the shudders, a supersonic plane and a supersonic engine.

Later he said:

We are just moving into the field of guided missiles . . .

Where is there anything in this act that is necessary to carry out the guided missile program, or that having to do with supersonic planes?

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** You would not know.

**Mr. Drew:** The minister says I would not know. I do know that the minister of defence production in Britain, who is responsible for a great deal more production than the minister here, does not need any powers of this kind in order to carry out not only the development of supersonic planes and guided missiles but hydrogen and atomic bombs as well.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** He has the powers.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, you may not have heard the minister. He said the British minister has the powers. That is the trouble. That is why it is so necessary to continue this debate. The minister does not yet realize that the British minister has not the powers, and neither has the head of defence production in the United States. There the powers are defined. I can just imagine what would happen in the congress of the United States if anybody had the temerity to put a bill like this before that body and ask for its adoption. There would not be a chance of it passing. There would not be a chance of these powers passing in the House of Commons at Westminster. If the minister does not yet realize that the provisions in this act to which I have referred do apply to the general powers to take over personal services as well as property of all kinds, and that those powers do go well beyond the other two acts, then that merely shows how little he has appreciated the course that has been followed.

In view of the fact the minister himself emphasizes his failure to understand that the traditional practice is to delegate the powers of parliament only for a precise and definitely limited purpose, and since he does not understand what is involved in that section that specifically creates a presumption of guilt, I think it is necessary to deal with the whole question of the presumption of guilt because that is the very thing for which we have been fighting for a long time. It is that every man shall be innocent under the law until judged guilty by his peers.