

Emergency Powers Act

on the resolution stage, and that debate on the resolution stage was not of a conclusive nature. When we saw the bill strong objection was taken on this side of the house to many of its provisions. When we saw it the thing then—

Mr. Garson: Did you vote against it?

Mr. Fleming: There was not a vote on that occasion, because the matter was under discussion. Objections were being taken from this side of the house. The government was parrying. The Prime Minister, I will say this, sought to meet some of these objections because they were valid objections. In the course of the discussion of this bill in committee several very sensible amendments were brought in on the suggestion and at the urging of the opposition. Then when the bill came up for third reading the house had before it this question—

Mr. Garson: Did you vote against it?

Mr. Fleming: The measure passed on division on third reading. Can the Minister of Justice get that through his head?

Mr. Garson: What about second reading?

Mr. Fleming: The minister is sitting there parroting, apparently for the sake of killing time in this house, stalling for time. I want to say to the Minister of Justice that when a measure is passed on division the opposition asserts in this house—and it is a matter of record—that the matter is opposed. When the matter is passed on division it indicates the opposition of the opposition.

Mr. Garson: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. Fleming: The minister can ask all the questions he likes.

Mr. Garson: If that be so, why did my hon. friend not call a division when the principle was decided on second reading?

Mr. Fleming: Perhaps I was guilty of a personal oversight in that matter. The matter was in the hands of my colleague the hon. member for Kamloops and myself. We put forward our position very plainly on second reading, and it was a position highly critical of the bill; and the smug Minister of Justice sits back there. He knows what would have happened if there had been a division. The government would have summoned its submissive cohorts and there would have been the usual result. We recorded our opposition to the measure in our speeches, and when the measure was called for third reading the record shows that it was passed on division.

[Mr. Fleming.]

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Not on second reading.

Mr. Fleming: If the very genial Minister of Public Works will look back at the record and will take the time to read the speeches that were made by my colleague the hon. member for Kamloops and myself on that occasion, if he will read them as I do not think he very often does—

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Not your speeches.

Mr. Fleming:—then I am quite sure he will rectify the erroneous impression he is under at the present time that there was no opposition. In every case I may tell him there was opposition.

We now come down to 1952. Again the Minister of Justice, when he spoke on this measure on an earlier occasion, now six weeks ago, said the measure was not opposed, that it had passed the house unanimously in 1952.

Mr. Garson: Did it not?

Mr. Fleming: That is a statement directly in the teeth of the facts.

Mr. Garson: Did you vote against it then?

Mr. Fleming: It would not be permissible for me to say that the Minister of Justice is trying to misrepresent. That would not be parliamentary but, Mr. Chairman, I am saying to the minister—

Mr. Garson: I am simply asking a fair question.

Mr. Fleming:—that the effect of what he is saying is to misrepresent the facts; and if he persists in misrepresenting the facts when the truth is again, as it has been previously, drawn to his attention, then he will have to abide by the consequences.

Mr. Brooks: Did he vote for it?

Mr. Fleming: What happened in 1952 has been told already, Mr. Chairman. You know about it so well. The only person who does not now know about it is the Minister of Justice, apparently. Everybody else knows perfectly well what happened. The Leader of the Opposition made a strong speech against this measure, a very strong speech. I say to the Minister of Justice that before he makes such a categorical assertion he should apprise himself of the facts given to the house, and the substance and pith of the statement made in this house by the Leader of the Opposition, which was highly critical of the bill and directly opposed to it and which indicated quite clearly that the opposition intended to vote against it.

Then the record is quite clear as to what happened at the end. When six o'clock came the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre