

088078

270221

34

COMMONS

implying that they are not severe enough. Of course, there are both points of view and both will have to be given consideration.

Having regard to the conditions that prevail in Canada, I wonder whether the Minister of Justice has not now some qualms of conscience at having repealed section 98 of the criminal code. He shakes his head, nevertheless I suggest that while it might not have been necessary in time of peace, it would be a useful adjunct to the laws of the country at the present time. I invite him to consider the reenactment of section 98.

I am glad in a way that the Prime Minister has decided to submit the whole question to a special committee, but I recognize this as an old practice of his, perhaps to evade responsibility. I say that in no harsh or vindictive spirit. My recollection of the first important project that was brought before this house in the session of 1922, when my right hon. friend was facing parliament for the first time as Prime Minister, is that there came up for consideration the question of railway rates in the west. His government, instead of having a policy on this great and vital question, referred the matter to a committee of the House of Commons and so passed on responsibility. I will remember the part played in that committee by the hon. gentleman who is now sitting in the treasury benches occupying the position of Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar). I remember the trial kite that was put out by the gentleman who was chairman of that special committee as to what the report would be—I refer to Hon. A. K. Maclean—and I believe my memory is accurate in that regard. It was stated that the committee was prepared to accept the draft report that had been made by the chairman and the present Minister of Mines and Resources, then representing Marquette. He put a pistol to the head of the Prime Minister and there was a right about face on the question. I have a long memory and I can recall that exactly. I remember being told the whole situation by a supporter of the government of that day, a gentleman who is not now on earth but whom the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ralston) knew very well in his lifetime. That gentleman said that never again would that sort of thing happen.

I hope that these references to committees are not made by the executive for the purpose of sidestepping responsibility. The government is responsible to the people and should have a policy.

The defence of Canada regulations are based, I take it, upon those in vogue in England, although I suppose they are not the exact counterpart. In fact, I have heard the

[Mr. R. B. Hanson (York-Sunbury).]

criticism that these regulations are very much more severe than those in England. Well, I think it is necessary in war time that some power should be vested in the executive to control subversive elements in the country. I am all for law and order. Whatever I may have been in my younger days, as I grow older and more mature I am all for law and order. I am for law and order in Canada in war time and I believe the government must have some power at its elbow.

I have been reading the life of Abraham Lincoln by Carl Sandburg, "Lincoln—the War Years," and I recall a criticism which was made of Lincoln and his government because of the virtual suspension of habeas corpus, and the unconstitutionality of the executive action at that time of travail in the life of our neighbouring republic. Subsequently, if I remember rightly, his act was declared ultra vires by a chief justice who had been a member of his own administration. What a situation! So far as I am concerned the Prime Minister and his government must have power by executive action to deal with any emergent situation that may arise from time to time while the country is at war, but I hope they will exercise that power with the utmost judicial discretion and will play no favourites. That is all I have to say in that regard.

I desire to devote some attention to the war effort of this administration. The Prime Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite may not agree with what I have to say, but as I stated in the very opening remarks I addressed to the house, this is a time for clear thinking and straight talking. May I refer to the situation in Canada prior to September, 1939. Perhaps I should go back a little farther than that, because during the election I heard in my own constituency a criticism of the government of Mr. Bennett from 1930 to 1935 on the ground that in those years it had not done anything with respect to the question of national defence or empire defence. I do not think it was a big issue in the election, but reference has been made to the question and I think I ought to justify the position that was taken at that time.

In the years from 1930 to 1935 Canada was in the throes of an economic revolution unparalleled in the history of the world. We were faced with declining revenues and with the necessity of imposing taxation upon the people, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the membership of this house how any government under those circumstances would have been justified in imposing new taxation upon the people of Canada for national or empire defence in the light of the situation as it was

888078

270222

MAY 20, 1940

35

then in Europe. I think I have only to ask the question to have the answer. No government would have been justified in 1933, when this country was in the depths of the economic depression, in asking parliament to impose new taxation on the people of Canada for national defence. If we had asked the people for any substantial sum of money for this purpose, what an uproar of indignation would have arisen from hon. gentlemen opposite, led by the Prime Minister himself! I have no doubt about that at all. I heard it on many occasions. My mind goes back to the time in 1922—hon. members know that as we get older we tend to become reminiscent; I hope I am not transgressing too much—when Hon. George P. Graham was Minister of Militia; the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power)—my friend from Quebec South, if he will permit me to call him so—was a member of this house and a supporter of the government, and he led a rebellion against the estimates of the militia department of that day. The Conservative party representation in this house at that time endeavoured to help the minister to put his estimates through, and, as I recall it, they were very modest estimates. I remember that the minister had to withdraw his estimates and bring them back greatly reduced in amount. If that was so in 1922 or 1923, when the country was blessed with the beneficent Liberal rule of my right hon. friend, and was returning to prosperity after the war years, what would he have said in 1933 if we had asked for any substantial amount for national defence? The roof would have been the limit.

Mr. STIRLING: It would not have been the limit; there would have been no limit.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So I am justifying my position with respect to not having asked the people of Canada for any large sum for national defence at that time. I believe, though—I am not sure about this; I have not looked it up—we did make a start in 1934 and 1935 with respect to the establishment of a government munitions plant in the province of Quebec. I remember that that was opposed by the right hon. gentleman, and if my memory serves me aright, immediately on being returned to power he suspended all operations with respect to that well-conceived plan which had been worked out by the Department of National Defence for the purpose of making munitions under the government of this country. I never heard any great criticism of that at the time, but I have heard a substantial amount of criticism since. Of course we are always wiser in the light of after-events.

From 1935 conditions materially changed with respect to the whole question of national defence. Who ever heard of Hitler in 1933? But you heard of him in 1934 or thereabouts, when he was made chancellor of the German reich. From then one thing evolved into another, and the head of the aggressor was raised in Europe. Still I am free to admit that none of us at that time expected that by 1939 we should be plunged into a tragic war. We all stood aghast at what he did to Austria, and when the rape of Czechoslovakia took place I felt sure that a madman was loose in Europe. After Munich—and I am making no criticism of Munich, let that be distinctly understood: if ever a man laboured and struggled to preserve the peace of the world it was the Right Hon. Neville Chamberlain. He deserves the sympathy of every one of us, and history will accord to him a very high place among the statesmen of the British empire. If hon. members are interested in reading about the struggle which he made, may I commend to them a book which I have recently written—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —which I have recently read. I am glad I do not write books. There is a saying—I think it is in the Bible: "Oh, that mine adversary had written a book!" Some people will refer to that very feelingly; perhaps the Prime Minister himself will remember that he wrote a book.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad I did.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —which I do not believe many people read to-day. I am bound to tell him that I never read it; I started to, but I could not finish it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a reflection on my hon. friend himself.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be true; I know I am stupid most of the time, but I confess that I never could get interested in the book. However, this is a digression. If any hon. member is interested in following the efforts of Mr. Chamberlain to preserve the peace of Europe and the world I commend to him the book of Sir Nevile Henderson, entitled "The Failure of a Mission." It is I think the first record that has been given to the public of the efforts of one of the greatest statesmen we have ever had in England; and because Mr. Chamberlain failed to achieve his purpose is no reason why he should be condemned. May I say further how much I admire him for what he did in the recent past, since this crisis came on, in unselfishly giving up his position at the head of the state when he found he could not command that