

Defence Production Act

you can save the day by negotiation. Yet in this measure they support the government in setting up the Department of Defence Production forever and ever, and giving the minister exceptional powers under the act to decide things for himself for the same length of time. Well, if there is such great hope for peace, and we all want it, one would not think the minister would need these exceptional powers forever.

How my C.C.F. friends weep and cry when the H-bomb or some other bomb or some new nuclear weapon is tested somewhere out in the Pacific. Oh, they are so alarmed. "Why is all this taking place?" Yet what they are voting for in this instance is to give the minister all the power he needs. Yes; if we happened to be manufacturing or finalizing these nuclear weapons the minister could go out into the middle of the Pacific ocean and bang them off or explode them. He would have power to do that under the act. And they are quite willing to support him, by accepting this measure.

Only a few weeks ago we were discussing the entry of West Germany into NATO. What was the purpose? The purpose was to make it possible for them to fight the aggressor with us, side by side. But the socialists split on that. "No, no; we cannot permit Germany to rearm even though they are rearming to fight by our side". But they are content to give the minister all these powers in the Department of Defence Production, so that we may continue producing the most deadly weapons it is possible to produce. It just does not add up, so far as I am concerned. It does not make sense; it is not logical; it is inconsistent.

If the government wants to have this department set up forever, if they want the minister to have these powers forever, then do they expect that war is inevitable? I do not know the answer, I do not know what their attitude is; but I do know that the other day a very high-ranking officer was fired because he spoke out of turn. And what was one of the things he said? While he may not have used these exact words, he indicated in what he said that war was coming, that it was inevitable.

I am not going to criticize the government for the position it has taken in reprimanding that gentleman for making a pronouncement of government policy. I stand with the leader of this group when he says that government policy should be announced by the government, and only by the government. And I stand with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that on major policy it should be announced in this House of Commons. Nevertheless there is an important

factor in this matter. I am not so much concerned with whether that high official spoke out of turn as I am—

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I ask the hon. member not to continue discussing the matter to which he is now referring, unless it has some direct bearing on the legislation before the house. He can realize the kind of argument we could have on that particular subject.

Mr. Hansell: Yes; I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you may have been somewhat concerned lest I should go too far afield. However, I was only going to say that I am concerned as to the truth of the statement more than with what action the government took in the matter. Is it true that war is inevitable? If it is, then of course we must have a department of defence production. If war is coming, then we must give the minister certain powers in serious times to mobilize the productive capacity of the country and produce those goods which are necessary for war.

But if that is so, then the government cannot have it both ways. It cannot say there is going to be peace, and at the same time prepare for war. I do not think anyone will disagree with that statement. When the minister, with his powers over defence production, mobilizes the productive capacity of the country to manufacture war supplies, why is he doing it? Why do we make bombers, if they are not to fly? Why do we make bristling atomic guns, if they are not to be fired? Why do we make any nuclear weapons if they are not to be used? Why do we spend \$3 billion a year on arms if they are not to be used? I should like to ask that question. Someone says, for safety. Well, I know that argument has been made over and over again, that we can negotiate by reason of our strength. It is a pleasant argument, but what does it really mean? It really means that if we are strong we can scare the enemy. Well, now, who is kidding who in this thing?

Mr. Knowles: Whom.

Mr. Hansell: Whom. War weapons are manufactured to be used, and certainly we are not kidding the enemy. We are not scaring the enemy as we negotiate, because up to now in their negotiations they have not shown one tiny thread of nervousness. As a matter of fact I am inclined to think that we are the boys who are nervous; for in all our negotiating from the standpoint of strength we have lost, for the most part.

We are opposed to this measure, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying we are opposed to the entire bill, particularly in respect to