

Emergency Powers Act

becomes law just the same as if it were brought into the house and debated. They cannot get away from the habit.

In my opinion that attitude is the serious feature of this whole situation today. I cannot understand why the government insists on forcing this emergency measure through. The date upon which this emergency powers measure becomes law again in Canada is going to be a bad day for the Canadian parliament, and a worse day for the Canadian people.

Mr. Fulton: Before actually saying what I have to say at this stage in connection with the resolution itself, Mr. Chairman, I regret that it is necessary to deal with the remarks made by the hon. member for Springfield a few minutes ago in an attempt to bring some personal discredit upon the Leader of the Opposition. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that in what I have to say my words will not reflect the actual extent of my feelings. I shall endeavour to keep within the rules. I observe also that the hon. member for Springfield is not here at the moment. And I shall, therefore, refrain from making any further comment on the type of attack which he was attempting to level on a personal basis against the Leader of the Opposition.

It is necessary to place the facts on the record so that they may appear in today's *Hansard* along with the remarks of the hon. member for Springfield. As was known to other members of the hon. gentleman's party, and I should be surprised if the facts were not known to him, the Leader of the Opposition was absent for part of three days this week because of the death of a member of his household. This member of the household died in the early hours of Tuesday morning. Notwithstanding that fact, the Leader of the Opposition was in the house during the first part of the sitting on Tuesday. On Tuesday evening, the Leader of the Opposition was at the funeral parlour arranging for the transportation of the body of this member of his household to Guelph on Tuesday night. On Wednesday morning he went to Guelph, whither the body had been transported, and he remained at Guelph for the purposes of the funeral which had been arranged to take place Thursday morning. While in Guelph he did drive to St. Catharines to address a non-political meeting of the St. Catharines chamber of commerce. He stayed in that part of Ontario until the funeral on Thursday morning, then flew back to Ottawa in time to be here for the presentation of the budget that evening. That is the chronology of the events to which the hon. member for Springfield has

seen fit to make reference in an effort to bring some sort of personal attack against the Leader of the Opposition, apparently in an effort to discredit him personally, as part of the personal smear campaign which has been carried on against the present Leader of the Opposition for some years now by Liberal members.

Mr. Sinnott: They were his own words.

Mr. Fulton: I feel that it is important that a few more things should be said in connection with this measure before this discussion in committee is concluded. There are a number of unusual things about this legislation, but perhaps none of them is more unusual than the circumstances under which it has been introduced. I want to suggest this as a serious consideration in connection with this measure. It stands on the order paper in the name of the Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister has not yet said a word in connection with it. This is a resolution preceding a measure which, if passed, will take away from parliament for a further year its powers in a wide field, and hand those powers over to the executive. It is, I suggest, one of the most important measures which will come before parliament at this session. It is a measure which I believe properly stands in the name of the Prime Minister.

This resolution has stood in the name of the Prime Minister on each of the two previous occasions upon which it has been discussed in this house. The Prime Minister has not yet seen fit to speak to this resolution, although it is significant that on each of the two previous occasions when the measure was debated the Prime Minister did speak. He spoke in 1951 at the very outset in explanation of the measure, and in explanation of the views of the government as to why it was necessary to have it. He spoke again in 1952 when the legislation was before us to extend the operation of the Emergency Powers Act for a further year. The Prime Minister then explained why it was considered necessary that it should be extended. But now, Mr. Chairman, on this occasion, when we are being asked to extend it for a third year—when we are being told that there exists the emergency of apprehended war; when we are told that by the Minister of Justice and are told that no fewer than nine times in the course of one speech; when we are told that this emergency is so serious that it is emphasized nine times, and that it is the emergency of apprehended war—we find that the Prime Minister does not choose to explain or perhaps he does not consider the matter of sufficient importance that he himself, as he did on two