

*Navigable Waters Protection Act*

on behalf of the government? And, as the minister well knows, a communist-led union is the recognized bargaining agency in that extremely important operation—as are also communist-led unions in the uranium mines, at this time.

If we find dangerous men in our ships, how about a law which will apply to everyone, and keep dangerous men out of all these other operations? And then let me come back to what, after all, is the very lifeblood of our productive system; I refer to electricity. Everyone knows that we are more dependent than any other country in the world, for our immense industrial production, upon electricity. A comparatively small team of highly trained saboteurs could paralyse the industrial production of Canada, if they were permitted to do so without interference. Why not have a law with general application which would make it possible to deal with such people?

And may I say something that I know the minister knows about—that there are known communists in some of our big hydroelectric plants today, and we have no law to deal with them at this time, although that is where they present a danger to Canada at this time.

For several years we have been asking for a simple, workable and clearly defined law that would define this kind of danger to which the minister refers. We have been asking for a law, not one to deal with any particular activity by name, but rather by a definition of that activity. We want an effort on behalf of any foreign power opposed to the safety and security of Canada to be an offence defined by law and punishable in our courts by Canadian jurors, and not punished behind closed doors by undefined laws, by undefined agents, and under terms that not one of us will know about if we give this power to the government. Now, with these powers, unsatisfactory in form, unsatisfactory in extent, this is a good time for a return to democracy, and this is a good time for the government to comply with the request we have made over and over again to define the offence with reference to a foreign power which is seeking to undermine the security of Canada and place it in a form that will make it possible to bring these dangerous men, to use the term employed by the Minister of Justice, before the courts of Canada, where Canadian jurors, with that justice which is the pride of Canada, can decide whether they are innocent or guilty, and if they are guilty, where they will be sent to jail, where they should be, if they are trying to undermine the security of our country.

[Mr. Drew.]

**Mr. Knowles:** I should like to return for a minute or two to the comments the Minister of Labour made in reply to something I said when we were at the second reading stage. The minister felt that I could not really mean it when I interpreted this section as making it possible to impose a penalty on a person because he sought employment. The minister, in answering me, read certain of the regulations under P.C. 2306 of May 2, 1952, and suggested that what was in the government's mind was the matter of providing penalties for any false declaration. As was brought out by the question put to him by the hon. member for Kamloops, there is included in the regulations No. 5, which reads:

No person shall accept employment or act as a seaman on board a Canadian ship in the great lakes, unless he is the holder of a provisional or regular seaman's card.

I look at the end of P.C. 2306 and I find that it says that everyone who contravenes any of these regulations—

... is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or to imprisonment not exceeding three months or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

I admit it is far-fetched, but I suggest the possibility is right there that if a person manages to get employment as a seaman on board a Canadian ship on the great lakes, contrary to the provisions of this order in council, he could be charged and sentenced to a fine of \$500 or to three months imprisonment, or to both such fine and such imprisonment. But, Mr. Chairman, apart from all that, may I point out that we are not voting on these regulations; we are voting on a section that is to be written into a law that will permit the government to make regulations. We are led to believe that the regulations that will be made will be the ones that are now in effect; we are led to believe that these regulations will be continued. That is not what we are voting on. We are voting on a clause which says, and I think the clause should be put on the record in its entirety:

The governor in council may make such regulations as he considers necessary or desirable in the interests of the safety or security of Canada respecting employment of seamen on board Canadian ships in the great lakes, and may prescribe the penalties to be imposed on summary conviction for violation of any regulation made under this section, but such penalties shall not exceed a fine of five hundred dollars or imprisonment for a term of three months or both fine and imprisonment.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that under that wording there is nothing involved but the matter of employment of seamen on board Canadian ships in the great lakes, and the right given to the government to impose