

Defence Production Act

should be incorporated forever into the statutes of Canada. Does the minister want to be able to say, when he goes to bed at night: I can control the whole Canadian industry by a simple telephone call. Is that what he wishes? Does he feel some satisfaction in forcing parliament to sit during the summer months, in this sultry heat? Is that the reason why—

Mr. Lesage: Whose fault is it?

Mr. Balcer: The government, with its stubbornness, is responsible.

Mr. Lesage: The fault is yours; you yourselves are responsible.

Mr. Balcer: Why does not the government accept the logical amendment proposed by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks)? Our friends opposite are obviously used to a certain dictatorship. It is a performance which we have had constantly before our eyes. For all practical purposes, when a minister introduces a bill, the hon. members opposite, from first to last, always accept it without any criticism, whether they have seen the bill or not. It is true that once, twice, or perhaps five times, some of them have criticized legislation, but they have always voted in favour of any proposal introduced by the government. There is nothing surprising in the fact that these people accept the element of dictatorship contained in the bill and in the Defence Production Act. I am not surprised that they have remained quite silent during this debate. They do seem tired by the weather, though, and anxious to return home. There is no doubt, in any event, that if it were left to government members, wider powers would have been handed to any minister, as long as they were allowed to go home.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the government will be able to realize that this roadblock thrown in its path by the Conservative opposition is a concrete sign that we will not budge until the government has proposed an amendment of its own or accepted ours, which is directed to limiting these dictatorial powers so as to safeguard our parliamentary system.

One thing has struck me in the course of this debate and it is the speeches of those Liberals in a hurry, your friends, the friends of the government, those gentlemen who sit to my left and who have attempted to show that the reason why our party was carrying on such a stubborn fight was that we wanted to protect big interests.

Well, I don't believe there is a political party that gets along better with the big financial interests than the Liberal party. Besides, I am going to point out as a small

example something that will enable all our friends opposite to get a lot of information on the matter. One has only to open the Parliamentary Guide to find the list of the Liberal senators. In the short biography which they have written themselves,—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Balcer:—we note that a majority of them are directors of several of the biggest concerns in this country—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): A flood of words in a desert of ideas.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to ask the hon. member not to refer in such terms to our colleagues of the other house, but rather to remain within the purview of the present debate.

Mr. Balcer: I accept your suggestion, Your Honour. However, I am very glad to say that the Conservative opposition did not undertake this fight against the passage of this bill simply to protect big business—

Mr. Lesage: Simply to—

Mr. Balcer:—as our friends opposite have been doing for years. Our party fights this bill in order to protect the whole Canadian industry, big and small, and even Canadian labour.

Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf): You should revise your text.

Mr. Balcer: This may cause our friends opposite to chuckle, but, as stated the other day by one of the members of the opposition, this bill confers upon the Minister of Defence Production the power to deprive labour of its right to strike.

Mr. Habel: It is not Mr. Duplessis.

Mr. Balcer: That is exactly what—

Mr. Langlois (Gaspé): He is referring to the Louiseville strike.

Mr. Balcer:—is written in section 31, subsection 2, paragraph (d), that is: the minister may require any person who supplies any essential service to do it on such conditions as the minister may prescribe.

An hon. Member: That is in Bill 19.

Mr. Fleming: Quiet.

Mr. Balcer: In Bill 19, there is no mention—

Mr. Habel: Will the hon. member permit me to ask a question?

Mr. Balcer: Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. Habel: Could he give us one instance where the Minister of Defence Production has used the powers under that section as was done by the premier of Quebec to disfranchise certain labour unions?