

*Emergency Powers Act*

concerned about the trend we now see that we might hope that within this house there would be a vote which would place any effective restraint upon a government which commanded a majority of that kind. Unless we return to established and tested principles of parliamentary democracy we may in fact at this hour be in the twilight of freedom here in Canada, no matter how much we believe in freedom itself. We Canadians can pay the penalty of surrender just as other people have paid the penalty of surrender of those principles which protected the freedom in which they believed.

Then, Mr. Speaker, having indicated in such clear and unequivocal terms our objection,—

**Mr. Garson:** May I have the page number?

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be interrupted in the middle of a sentence nor do I intend to be interrupted except on a question of privilege or a point of order.

**Mr. Garson:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I think it has been the custom, among courteous members of parliament, that when another member wishes to know the page of *Hansard* which is being quoted, the hon. member who is quoting will give it to him.

**Mr. Rowe:** That is not a question of privilege.

**Mr. Drew:** That was not a question of privilege and the minister well knows it. The minister well knows that I gave the date and the page from which I was quoting; it is 952.

**Mr. Rowe:** The hon. member gave it before he started quoting.

**Mr. Drew:** May I just point out that, having indicated clearly our objection to this measure and our objection to the principles that were inherent in a wide-open bill without any definition of the circumstances under which these wide powers could be invoked, we indicated our objection to the bill by the accepted practice of saying "On division".

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss at all the extraordinary process of reasoning by which the minister has once again, in spite of the fact that this has been pointed out to him before, tried to distort the facts as to what took place in this house by suggesting that we supported the measure on that occasion. We opposed the measure, and we opposed it on every possible occasion when the measure was actually before us. The words he quoted by way of indicating our approval were words that were used at the time that the bill was not before us and when we presumed that the bill was going to define the authority of the government.

Let me now come to the remarkable mental gyrations of the Minister of Justice in the

contentions that he has put forward. He has said: They approved this measure before—which of course is not so—and then they say, "Because you did not do what we, a minority, think you should have done, we now say that we will not support what we supported on an earlier occasion."

**Mr. Garson:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I never said any such thing as applied to my hon. friend's party. My remarks were entirely confined to the Social Credit and C.C.F. parties; they had no reference to my hon. friend, and his statement is quite wrong.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, my statement is not wrong in any word. My statement referred to what the Minister of Justice—

**Mr. Garson:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Drew:** I insist on finishing my sentence, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Garson:** Mr. Speaker, I have stated what I said and I believe that, by the rules of the house, my hon. friend, whether he likes it or not, is under obligation to accept my statement.

**Mr. Drew:** The minister well knows that I am compelled to accept a statement that was made, but the statement he made was not earmarked in relation to anyone in this house. The statement he made was a general statement. Since he now says it referred only to others besides the members of the Conservative party, that in no way changes the purport of what he said. It does not change it in any way. It is an equally distorted form of reasoning.

**Mr. Knowles:** It makes it worse.

**Mr. Drew:** It only makes it worse, in fact; because he apparently thinks that we are mind-readers and that we know which of these mental gyrations of his is intended to relate to one part of the house or another.

In that particular case let me remind the minister that I heard no suggestion that this bill was not now being supported because the government had not said that it would do what the minority said it should do. As I recall it, what was said in that respect was that there was a great deal of objection on this side of the house to the fact that the government had put forward this bill with the assurance that it was going to deal with controls and that we objected to the government's asking for a renewal of the same bill when they had shown that that was not their intention and they had never invoked the powers for that purpose.