

to be misunderstood, because I think the question is a proper one; but at the moment I was leading up to the point I wished to make. When the minister stated that there was a principle at stake in this bill, the only control he referred to was a control with reference to prices. In order to bolster up his argument he went back to the prices that prevailed during the inflation days following the last war. He says that no reference should be made to the details of the bill. I contend that parliament, in a desire to assure that there shall be a fair distribution of scarcity and that the dangers of inflation shall be prevented, will be in general agreement provided that specific measures are brought before it. What the government in fact is doing under the guise of this bill is to introduce a measure which goes farther than any other ever introduced in this parliament or any other parliament in the empire, and which far exceeds the powers asked for by the government of the United Kingdom within the last six or seven weeks, and it need hardly be mentioned that in that country there is in power a Labour government which intends to change the whole economic system and bring into effect socialism by the socialization of banks, coal mines and other great industries.

Let me point out that the powers being asked for in the bill that are objected to are not the powers that were referred to by my learned and hon. friend; they are powers that cover everything that any province could possibly do under its constitutional powers, as well as everything that parliament can do. If, as the minister says, all the government is asking for is the power to impose certain controls, I say to them: Bring in a measure to that effect and tell us how they are going to operate. The government should not be permitted through a measure conferring upon them general powers, to ask for the powers that are vested in them by this legislation.

Only the other day the Minister of Finance enunciated a proposition with regard to cabinet government which was a return to the days of Charles I. It was of interest to me to note that in the quotation the minister gave at the end of his remarks he indicated that he had been reading of the period of Charles I and Charles II. Here is what this government is asking for. It is asking parliament to delegate to the governor in council the following powers: First, all the powers under the War Measures Act as it exists to-day. Then the bill says this:

and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms—

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

In other words the War Measures Act does not give the government sufficient powers. It goes on:

—it is hereby declared that the powers of the governor in council extend to all matters coming within the classes of subjects hereinafter enumerated.

Let me refer to those subjects:

(a) production, manufacture, trading, exportation and importation.

Everything under the sun that business or agriculture could do in Canada is covered by that. And the powers asked for are over and above those contained in the War Measures Act is contained in that paragraph. Then "(b) foreign exchange." I am not going to argue about that, realizing the necessities of the moment and the agreements among the united nations. Then "(c) transportation by air, road, rail or water." If the only control the government wants is the control over prices, as has been stated, why ask for control over transportation by air, road, rail or water? What is the purpose of that? Then the next:

(d) supply and distribution of goods and services, including the fixing of prices;

(e) employment, including salaries and wages.

These are the only two controls to which the minister made reference. Next (f):

(f) appropriation, control, forfeiture and disposition of property and of the use thereof, including the control of rentals and occupation.

Why does this government ask for the power of forfeiture of property? If the only control that is necessary is one over prices in order to ensure a fair distribution of goods in scarcity, and to prevent inflation, I ask again, why does the government ask for the power of forfeiture? Little wonder that the minister was somewhat apologetic when he stated how difficult it was to come before parliament and ask that these undemocratic powers be vested in the governor in council. I am pleased with what the government did in regard to the legislation in dispute in the province of Saskatchewan, in that it has left that legislation to the courts. That is democratic; it is proper; it is the course, I say with deference, that should have been followed. But under this act it asks for powers that no socialist government taking power in this country could ever surpass; in fact, a socialist government could with much fewer powers change the entire economic system of this country.

I go on to the next:

(g) entry into Canada, exclusion and deportation, and revocation of nationality.

Sir, what has that to do with controls over prices and the assurance that everyone shall receive a fair share under rationing and at