

Navigable Waters Protection Act

I have mentioned. If we are trying to deal with dangerous men who are making an effort to sabotage important transportation equipment, or any other equipment in our economy or society at this time, then why deal alone with steamships in a limited area? Why deal with a limited means of communication, with a limited activity in a limited area? Why not define the offence and make it applicable to anyone, under the jurisdiction of Canadian courts? If dangerous men are to be prevented from committing sabotage, or otherwise from undermining the security of Canada, why should that not apply below the Victoria bridge at Montreal as well as above it? Is the danger any less because it happens to be on the mighty St. Lawrence, right down to its mouth, below the Victoria bridge? I do not think so.

Is the danger any less on the Peace river, the Athabasca river or the Mackenzie river, where the uranium bodies are the most precious in the world today? Is it any less on the ships between Great Britain and Newfoundland? Is it any less on the extremely important ships carrying precious freight between the mainland and Vancouver island? Is it any less in those ships plying the waters of Hudson bay? Is it any less on the other lakes, not included in what we define as the great lakes? Precious cargoes of immense importance to Canada may be moving in those lakes.

And that applies only to the ships. What about the coastal ships under Canadian registry carrying vitally important traffic? What about the coastal ships carrying alumina up to Kitimat, in northern British Columbia? What about the ships carrying alumina up the St. Lawrence and up the Saguenay, to the Shipshaw plant in Quebec? They would not come under this clause in the bill, as related to the Victoria bridge in Montreal.

Let us look at other things; let us look at some of the other means of transportation. What about sabotage on the railways? What about sabotage on the air lines—because, after all, we know of cases of sabotage on the air lines. And they form an extremely important part of our communications system. What about sabotage in the great communications system that provides the nerve centres—the telegraph lines, the wire lines? That would be a good place for sabotage, if someone wanted to destroy their effectiveness.

What about the pipe lines that carry the oil; what about the refineries and the storage centres in the country? Are not dangerous men likely to do harm there, and in exactly the same circumstances, and with the same disloyalty as is dealt with here? What about

the gas pipe lines, and the distribution equipment which is likely to be so important—and was so important in the last war? What about the private companies producing military equipment? Would not dangerous men, with sabotage as part of their plan, be just as dangerous there as on any ships? What about explosive plants carrying out production for the government? Would not sabotage there be more effective and more destructive and more far-reaching than anything that might be done in any single ship on the great lakes, in the ordinary course of events?

And, Mr. Chairman, what about foreign ships that ply our waters so regularly, and now carry so much traffic? May I remind this committee that if there is a hydrogen bomb or an atomic bomb exploded in the vicinity of Toronto or Hamilton, or any of our inland cities, it will not likely be carried by aircraft; it will likely be carried on a ship, where it can be hidden easily. That is well recognized. There is even greater danger of the transmission of a hydrogen bomb or atomic bomb by ship than by aircraft.

Of what use is a measure to limit the activities of dangerous men if it does not deal with foreign ships?

Mr. Garson: Would the Leader of the Opposition permit a question?

Mr. Drew: No. I would prefer to continue until I have finished. I welcome the minister's interest, and I shall listen to him with interest; but when asking a question, because of his interest in the subject he has the habit of making a speech within a speech. I would prefer to finish my remarks.

Mr. Garson: It might be an embarrassing question.

Mr. Drew: No, it would not be embarrassing at all. The minister never asks questions which are embarrassing, but they can be disturbing.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Sometimes they are embarrassing to himself.

Mr. Drew: I would prefer to continue, because I wish to keep the context clear.

I am simply pointing out how ineffective as well as improper is a limited provision of this kind—one that is limited not only as to geography but also as to the particular type of transportation and particular occupation involved.

What about known communists in the uranium mines in Canada? That is a question that relates directly to this. What about known communists in the heavy water operations being carried on by a private company