

*Defence Production Act*

of C. D. Howe to go ahead and do it. His record has shown that he can get things done in an emergency. I am proud to stand before this House of Commons and say that, even although I disagree with him on politics and very often on his policies.

What is the situation with which we are now faced in connection with this bill? There are only two sections to it. As to the first one, everyone says there is no opposition regarding the salary of the Minister of Defence Production. There is only one other section, and it relates to whether or not there shall be a limit on the time the act is in force. The amendment says it is now to be perpetual. Yet, Mr. Speaker, have you noticed that in two days of debate the discussion has been on the powers in that act, which powers have been in effect and have been law for a good many years in the Dominion of Canada.

**Mr. Trainor:** Five, to be exact.

**Mr. Winch:** My hon. friend says, "Five, to be exact".

**An hon. Member:** Four.

**Mr. Winch:** Four years or five years. The Conservatives change their minds all the time. However, it has been the law. The powers have been there over this period of years. The only question arising now is this. Shall they continue and be reviewed?

As I said, I have been listening most carefully to all the discussion that has taken place for two days. Most of all I have been interested in what my friends in Her Majesty's loyal opposition have had to say on this matter. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker—and I am going to express this only as an opinion, because otherwise I would be out of order—that they are putting up a sham battle and beclouding the issue because they are the official opposition and feel obliged to oppose anything brought in by the government.

That is a principle with which I as a member of the opposition do not agree. If the government brings in something that is good, I am going to support it. If I think it needs amending, I am going to try to amend it. If it should be opposed, I am going to oppose it. If the precedent is good, support it. If it is bad, then wipe it out. If a new precedent is required, then let us bring it in.

At this session we have heard a great deal about the serious world situation. We all hope for peace. We all want it. We will all work for it. However, things happen speedily in this modern age. We are now spending on defence 47 per cent of the entire revenue of

the federal government. At the beginning of the last war it was made clear that private enterprise companies in Canada had no patriotism with regard to Canada, that they had patriotism only with regard to their own dividends. That fact was made clear in a speech made here this afternoon. It was made clear in a speech made by the minister in 1940, or was it in 1941? Because of experience, and because the minister desires to have protection for Canada and to be able to move speedily in the interests of Canada, he requires a continuation of these powers.

The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Montgomery), who spoke just before I rose, was talking about socialistic powers and said that a continuation of the act was socialism. Socialism introduced by whom? The bill was introduced by the Prime Minister of Canada, who I do not think is a socialist. Second reading was moved by whom? By the Minister of Defence Production, who is not, I am certain, a socialist. I know these men are not socialists. Yet from their knowledge that private enterprise in Canada, even in an emergency of war, will put their profits before the interests of Canada, they feel that they need these powers in order to ensure that in the event of another emergency the minister in charge of defence production will have the power to control industry on behalf of the Canadian people.

**Mr. Fleming:** Six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

**Mr. Winch:** At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was at the point of concluding my remarks on second reading of the bill which is now before us. Although there has been a two-hour intermission, I have not used that time for the purpose of adding to my remarks. I was at the point of closing at six o'clock, and I am only going to add exactly what I was going to say if I had had the time prior to six o'clock.

First of all I should like to reiterate my opening remarks. I would say that those on the government side should not oppose all suggestions from the opposition merely because they come from the opposition. Secondly, I would say that members on the opposition side, irrespective of party, should not oppose any government measure or principle merely because it comes from the government. I feel that this is the essence of good government and a good parliament.