

*Export and Import Permits Act*

which the Department of Trade and Commerce had administered both import and export control. The committee was greatly assisted in that task by Mr. W. Frederick Bull who was, until this past week, the deputy minister of trade and commerce and who made a profound impression on the members of that committee as he reviewed the administration of these important controls with which he had been closely associated.

May I in passing pay this brief tribute to Mr. Bull. I think all members of this house recognize the fact that Mr. Bull has been an exemplary civil servant and an extremely distinguished deputy minister of trade and commerce. I am sure that in his new duties in the diplomatic field as this country's ambassadorial representative to Japan he will carry with him the good wishes of all hon. members of this house.

That was the last time any opportunity has been afforded to the house for a detailed review of the operations of this control legislation. I might interject here that it was extended by annual bills for a time, because this kind of control was regarded as so definitely of limited duration in those days—I refer to the late 1940's—that it was simply extended a year or a year and a half at a time until 1951 when the legislation was somewhat recast.

At that time the government asked for five years' extension of the legislation and of the very wide powers that were conferred upon them. They managed to pass their bill through the House of Commons, but the Senate proposed an amendment limiting the duration of the bill to three years. That amendment was finally accepted, and accordingly the legislation expired in 1954. In the bill introduced in that year it was given three years' duration. I therefore emphasize the fact that in the past decade, every time this legislation has come up for discussion it has been put before the house on the basis of being legislation for a limited duration because it has been recognized that the powers are so wide that there could be no justification for conferring them in permanent statutory form upon any minister.

What then are the conditions existing today which justify a continuation of these very wide powers for a further period of three years? It is fair to compare the conditions today with the conditions which were thought to justify the conferring of these powers in 1954 or earlier years.

So far as export control is concerned, if we turn back to 1947 we will see that at that time the principal condition with which the bill sought to deal was a scarcity of goods. The argument was put forward that controls

had to be introduced with a view to equitable distribution of goods. The statement was made by the then minister of trade and commerce on February 18, 1947, as reported at page 568 of *Hansard* of that year:

While the main purpose of the export control is to ensure adequate supply in Canada, the export controls are also necessary to enable us to carry out Canada's commitments in connection with those foodstuffs which are in world short supply and which, by common agreement of the United Nations, must be formally allocated to ensure an equitable distribution.

Then he added this:

A third type of control which is envisaged by this measure is that relating to the movement of arms, munitions and war materials and supplies.

When the powers were renewed in 1954 it was recognized by the government that the need for maintaining control over goods in order to ensure equitable distribution no longer could be regarded as a serious matter in view of the fact that the scarcity of goods no longer existed. But in the meantime the other purpose of the bill had loomed into larger proportion. We were in the post-Korea period and the necessity for preserving, in concert with other interested nations, a form of export control over strategic materials was very pressing in its impact upon the house. Even in 1954 there were indications that the nations concerned in applying these export controls on strategic materials during the Korean period were beginning to take a second look at the list of strategic materials and were considering some modification of the list and of the strict controls attached thereto.

There has been some change in conditions in that regard since then. There has been some modification in the list of strategic materials. But the question that must confront the house and, not least of all, those of us who are chronically opposed to the conferring of sweeping powers on the government under conditions short of emergency, is this: is it essential under present conditions that power should be continued in the government to impose, by order in council or by ministerial order, control over export of strategic materials with a view to preventing them from falling into the hands of the communists or being exported to communist countries? It seems to me that is the nub of the problem that must be faced by the house in addressing itself to the question of whether it shall or shall not support the principle of the bill.

Sir, conditions in the world today may be somewhat improved in some quarters over 1954. They are worse in other quarters of the world. We have not had any occasion since 1954 to learn to trust the communists or their