

Defence Production Act

referring to weapons that have nothing to do with the effect and interpretation or application of this act. This act has nothing whatever to do with the hydrogen bomb. The Minister of Defence Production is not building a hydrogen bomb. This act has nothing to do with it. Any hon. member opposite who tries to create the impression that this act has any relationship to the construction or effect of the hydrogen bomb is trying to mislead the house and mislead the public. Certainly, the hydrogen bomb is the deadliest weapon that has ever been invented. The very deadliness of that weapon does create the hope of a great measure of stability, even under the pressure of terror itself. It has given hope to many people that we have returned to a balance of power, if you like, under which the full horror of a general war may conceivably be avoided. Please God, that may be the result. It should be the prayer and the hope of every hon. member, of every Canadian and every thinking human being. No hon. member on this side of the house has suggested for one moment that everything should not be done which will in every way strengthen our part in the common effort to preserve freedom and to clarify the confusing things that are in issue in this cold war in which we are now engaged.

But, Mr. Speaker, this attempt to wrap around this act the suggestion that some of these things have some bearing on the necessity for this act should be dispelled, and the very fact that hon. members opposite have made some of the interjections they have made this morning does emphasize the regretful necessity for continuing to discuss the subject and to emphasize the reasons why this act is in no way related to an emergency, but that it is a piece of legislation which the minister has described as permanent, and to use his exact words, it is being placed on the statute books as part of the law relating to defence which is exclusively a federal responsibility. Therefore, by that very fact it would only come in conflict with provincial legislation to the extent of the powers conferred by this act itself.

It being one o'clock, Mr. Speaker, may I move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member does not wish to move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Drew: No, may I call it one o'clock?

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, shortly before we adjourned the Minister of Defence Production [Mr. Drew.]

(Mr. Howe) challenged the suggestion that anyone on the government side of the house had spoken of an emergency. I do not need to go back over the numerous occasions upon which he has sought to create the impression of an emergency, because hon. members are well aware of the efforts he made along that line. But perhaps it would be best if I were to indicate the extent to which he has impressed the members on his own side with his arguments. It will be by their words that we can best indicate what impression they have gained about the situation.

Naturally the number on the other side of the house who are available to interpret the opinion is very limited, because we have heard from so few of them. However, in the intervening period I did have a short time to check up in this matter, and I have found, for instance, that on June 9 the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Philpott) made this very emphatic statement, as it is reported at page 4568 of *Hansard*:

There is a world emergency and it is perhaps the most serious emergency there has ever been in the history of the world.

This was in relation to the speeches that were being made on this bill. That was a clear enough use of the word "emergency".

Then the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) on June 20 took us to task in regard to this subject when he used these words:

We talk about the need for these continuing emergency powers.

The hon. member for Spadina described them as emergency powers. That is the impression that has been left in the minds of hon. members opposite in regard to this subject as a result of the interpretation that has been placed upon the act by the Minister of Defence Production.

Now, there is another aspect to this discussion that I think will bear examination, and that is the effort made by the Minister of Defence Production to justify his idea of emergency powers by what was done in another jurisdiction. I would not, of course, have thought of bringing this subject in, had it not been for the fact that it was introduced voluntarily by the Minister of Defence Production without having been raised in any way from this side of the house.

He attempted to show that in the province of Ontario, at a time when I happened to be the premier of that province, we had dealt with emergency measures in a way that even exceeded the powers he is now seeking. This is what he says at page 5381 of *Hansard* for this year:

The power act was amended in 1947 to provide that no action could be taken against the Ontario hydro in time of emergency. Another paragraph