

Defence Production Act

give the quotation or the source from which he makes that statement. I would recall to his memory, if he has forgotten, that the man about whom he is speaking had two gallant sons in uniform during the war and that he has no reason to be ashamed of his participation in the war.

Mr. Gillis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to look up that reference, he has a bigger research department than I have and he can put it on the record when he has his chance to speak in the debate.

An hon. Member: Where did you find it? Give us that page now.

An hon. Member: You would not find that in the Senate *Hansard*.

Mr. Gillis: I am making the statement, and it stands until you disprove it.

Mr. Fleming: That is not worthy of you.

Mr. Gillis: The funny thing about my hon. friends the Tories is that I did not mention any names but apparently every one of them knew who it was.

Mr. Fleming: Every one knew that you had not given a correct statement.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, let us keep the debate on an orderly level. The hon. member knows perfectly well that there is only one former leader of this party to whom these remarks could apply, and he is making remarks without any justification and without being prepared to have the courtesy to offer a quotation from some known record.

Mr. Sinclair: There are so many former leaders it is hard to distinguish them.

Mr. Gillis: As I have sat here for the best part of the last two days, I have listened to some crazy statements, but at least I had the courtesy to sit and listen patiently, recognizing the fact that those who were making them had a right to the floor.

Mr. Fleming: When they quoted they gave the sources, and quoted them accurately.

Mr. Gillis: The hon. member for Eglington, who talked for a long time, certainly read the Defence Production Act in its entirety three times.

Mr. Drew: Obviously he did not read it often enough.

Mr. Gillis: If the quotations had been taken out of his speech, he would not have made any speech at all.

Mr. Fleming: I did it for your benefit.

Mr. Gillis: When I get up here to speak I at least try to express my own opinion—

Mr. Fleming: And your own paraphrase of other people's.

Mr. Gillis:—after having listened to what was said in the house over a long period of time. However, I am merely pointing out the need for this legislation. If the minister has had the experience that many members of the house have had, of having to deal with people who place their own interests and the business of making money above the interests of the country, even in the emergency that existed from 1939 to 1945, then there is just as much justification for placing that legislation on the statute books as there is for writing laws against bank robbers or potential murderers or, as I said before, riot acts and the rest of them. It is not that we want to go out and enforce these laws, but they are there as a deterrent. This law is designed to prevent those who control the economic processes of this country, particularly the materials that are essential to war, from bartering the interests of the nation in order to make profits for themselves. The only people who are afraid of laws are those who are potential lawbreakers.

An hon. Member: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Gillis: That has always been my approach to any particular law.

Mr. Knowles: Let those whom the cap fits wear it.

Mr. Drew: That is what Hitler said.

Mr. Gillis: Once a democratic law—as this one is—is passed and we know it and it is advertised, if you are a good citizen you will obey that law. I think the fastest way in which to get repeal of a bad law is to enforce it often enough. If this law is bad and it were to be exercised by the minister in the manner suggested by the opposition, I think at the next session of the house it would be repealed. But these powers are not something that is new. I think the powers contained in this particular bill are already contained in the British North America Act.

I do not want to get into the field of arguing law. I believe that the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) is considered to be a good lawyer. I believe there are others on the other side of the house. At the present time, under the British North America Act the government has the power to declare any work in Canada to be a work in the interests of Canada, if they so desire, and to bring it under the management of the federal government or at least within the scope of federal laws. What is there in this bill that changes that particular picture? As to the matter of conscription, somebody says they never suggest doing that. It is