

*Defence Production Act*

or other naval, army or air force works, or works required for the production, maintenance or storage of defence supplies.

And then paragraph (f):

"defence supplies" means

(i) arms, ammunition, implements of war, vehicles, mechanical and other equipment, water-craft, amphibious craft, aircraft, animals, articles, materials, substances and things required or used for the purposes of the defence of Canada or for co-operative efforts for defence being carried on by Canada and an associated government.

It will be seen that these paragraphs take in practically everything within the boundaries of this dominion, from the polar regions to the great lakes, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I see also that it refers to "animals". We have been told on many occasions in the house in the debate on this bill that the minister has control over defence production. However, we see in this paragraph that he has control over practically everything manufactured in industry or raised on the farms of Canada. And when the minister can take control over animals raised on Canadian farms it means that he has within his authority not only control over industry but also control over agricultural products. If he were so inclined—and I am quite certain he would not, although his successor, whoever he might be, might have the inclination—he could go out to the farms and say to a farmer, "You must replace your dairy herd with a beef herd." He could say to that farmer, "You must transfer your operations from dairying to grain growing." In other words he is given sole control over the dairy industry as well as over industrial operations throughout the country.

Perhaps I might add, in a jocular fashion, that if he decided that employees in defence production plants were growing fat and lazy and were consuming too much milk rich in butterfat, he could come out to my farm and say, "Stanton, you will have to change from a Jersey herd to one that produces less fat in the milk. You are affecting the workers in my industrial plants. They are getting fat and lazy, and are not fulfilling their duties." I am saying this in a jocular way, but I wish to bring out the immense powers that are given to the minister or to any succeeding ministers who administer this act.

There are other parts of the act which are far-reaching, sections 23, 24, 25, 26, 31 and 36; but I wish to draw attention to section 40, which reads:

The Defence Supplies Act has no force or effect while this act remains in force except in so far as it is necessary to give effect to anything done thereunder before the 1st day of April, 1951.

This act is one of the first acts of the dominion. It has priority over practically all other acts of parliament. It is the one

50433—368½

act, and I say, Mr. Speaker, we should be more cautious in making this a permanent act on our statute books.

At page 5722 of *Hansard* of July 5, the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Hollingworth) said:

We must divest ourselves of every other consideration for the time being. The times are extraordinary; they are dangerous.

We all agree that the times are not what they were 50 years ago. At the present time the world is uneasy. Yet we will all agree that world conditions are far more settled now than they were in 1951 when this act was brought into being. Indeed, just the other day the Prime Minister informed us that tension in the world had eased. In fact, it has eased so much that the government is ready at the present time to trust the countries behind the iron curtain in the sale of our products. It must have eased considerably. In fact, we are all of that opinion or the government I am sure would not have taken that chance.

However, Mr. Speaker, the times are not such that we must give the minister these unlimited powers for an extended period. We on this side of the house have no quarrel with the Defence Production Act; we know it is necessary at the present time; but it is so drawn, it is of such a general scope, it covers so much of the economy of this country that since we are not in the throes of war, we feel it should have some clause in it limiting its time. The government should be able to bring it back to the house for parliament to pass on it. We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that our representatives in the cabinet and the government should be representative of parliament. The government should represent the citizens of the Dominion of Canada. Therefore, I repeat, this act should definitely have a time limit. We have no quarrel with one year or two years. Perhaps we would be willing to accept three years, but it definitely should not go on and on and be eternal.

The hon. member for York Centre also said:

As a humble backbencher and supporter of the government, may I say that these safeguards certainly satisfy me. But the government has leaned over backward and has gone much further in order to ensure full debate on this measure.

They have leaned over backward. I would say that in asking for the deletion of the expiry date in this bill the government has leaned far over to the left. If they lean much farther, Mr. Speaker, they will fall right into the laps of my hon. friends to the left, the socialists, the C.C.F. It is well-known the Prime Minister made the statement that the C.C.F. were Liberals in