

I do not believe in wholesale decontrol. I realize that there must be a degree of gradualness. In this regard the minister saw fit to compare Canada with Great Britain. Let us compare them, then, from the point of view of the speed with which the two countries have respectively decontrolled. In Canada, between V-E day and October 22, 1945, the total number of orders in council that had been dealt with, which had been passed under the War Measures Act, were: revoked, 13; revoked in part, 5. Since V-J day there have been revoked in their entirety, 21 and revoked in part, 5.

In Great Britain the home secretary, when introducing the measure in the House of Commons on October 10, pointed out that as far as possible the government to which he belonged would ensure that parliament maintained control over controls and that orders in council would be revoked with dispatch, particularly those that were undemocratic. This is what he said—as reported in the press—speaking in the House of Commons:

The government intends only to retain those war-time powers which were desirable in the public interest during the period of transition from war to peace.

The government of the United Kingdom do not want all the powers this government is asking for, and in the main, are keeping the power to control prices and to make sure that all will receive a fair distribution. He goes on:

On May 8, V-E day, there were in existence 342 defence general regulations and 345 other regulations; a total of 687. On the next day the present Lord President of the Council, then the Home Secretary—

Mr. Morrison.

—announced the withdrawal of 84 of the general regulations and 95 others, a total of 179.

He then points out that since the Attlee government came into power it has been doing the same, and the result is that to-day the total number that has been reduced is 219 general regulations and 241 others, a total of 460. The only powers that Britain is retaining in its government are the powers that affect activities that must be continued during the period of transition if chaos is to be avoided.

What is the situation here under section 5? The total number of formal acts of the governor in council up to September 28 is 94,731 including 58,402 orders in council. These are orders in council that have been brought to light. How many are there that have not been brought to light? How many secret orders in council is this parliament asked to approve under section 5, making them law on and after the date on which this bill becomes law? Only the other day the

Eldorado order in council was brought to light, two months after it had been passed. The seamen's order, which denied a man the right to have counsel, and placed him in the position where he could be brought before a board and made to give evidence against himself and be sent to prison thereunder, came to light in the prosecution of an unfortunate in British Columbia.

Section 5 ratifies everything that the government has done under the War Measures Act and all the orders in council in effect on the date when this bill becomes law. If this bill had become law when it was first introduced, or two or three or four weeks afterwards, parliament by passing the measure would have been unwittingly approving the Eldorado order in council, although it was a secret order, however tyrannical its operation and however detrimentally it might have affected justice. I do not know how many orders in council were passed under the War Measures Act, and neither does the minister, because he told me so in answer to a question some weeks ago. No one knows. The minister said it would require a careful examination over a considerable period to find out, first, those that were passed under the provisions of the War Measures Act, and second, those which, while not designating the War Measures Act as the parent, had nevertheless been in effect passed thereunder.

I repeat, under section 5 parliament is asked to give approval to orders in council passed under the War Measures Act, sight unseen, in some cases unheard of by parliament. That section when it was introduced, had it been translated into law; would have afforded the commissioner under Eldorado an opportunity to exercise tyrannical powers and would have denied anyone affected by this provision recourse to the courts, because it would have been considered to have been passed by this parliament, and as the minister stated if parliament declares that there is an emergency the courts will accept a lawful emergent legislation passed in consequence, and cited in support of his contention the Fort Frances case.

Parliament should not be asked on second reading or on any other reading to approve and adopt as its own star chamber legislation which it does not know anything about, the production of which was denied—held back is possibly a better way of putting it—and in respect of which the government refused or neglected for one month to answer questions I asked on October 5. Under the guise of giving support to certain controls we are asked to stand up manfully in this parliament and say to the government: We place