

*Navigable Waters Protection Act*

respect to the Minister of Justice, I do not think he really could have expected us to take seriously the arguments he presented a few minutes ago. He said this particular measure must go in to protect the Welland canal, among other things. Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest this. I have a higher opinion of the intelligence of any possible subversive elements in Canada than to imagine that one of them who has in mind the blowing up of the Welland canal is going to all the trouble of trying to get a job on one of the steamships on the lakes. I suspect he will take the bus down and will go and blow it up that way, or if he does not want to do that, if he wants to do it more easily even, if he has some nautical aspirations, then he will buy a ticket on one of the passenger boats and drop it overboard as he goes through. What nonsense!

Does the Minister of Justice insist on screening all the employees of the Canadian Pacific who go through the Rogers pass tunnel? Does he insist on screening all the employees of the Canadian National Railways who go through the Fraser canyon, any one of whom could toss a bomb which could destroy and disrupt the trade of Canada just as effectively as the destruction of the Welland canal—and more effectively, because it would cut off the Canadian west coast of this country? What nonsense!

I have had some experience with screening propositions, Mr. Speaker. About eighteen months ago I had to sign an affidavit that I would not reveal any state secrets that might be involved in the waste of public money on naval vessels in a certain dockyard in Canada, and I had to sign an affidavit that I would not reveal anything that came to my knowledge in the course of my employment. The young man who was giving me this security test, which was a very solemn affair, told me that he would leave this with me and I could study it for a few minutes and he would be back later and then we could sign it with all due solemnity. When he came back I signed it. He said: "Have you read it?" I said: "Yes, I have read it". "You can understand it?" I said: "Yes, quite easily". I rather shattered the young man. I said: "You know, this thought occurs to me, that if I were a Russian spy I would sign this without the slightest hesitation, and if that is the only means you have of keeping subversive elements out of the yard, then this yard is in a bad way". Whereupon the young man said: "But you forget this; having signed this, you are now liable to 14 years in the penitentiary". I suggested that 14 years would not be a circumstance to what would happen to me if they caught me with

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo).]

a bomb in my pocket. Mr. Speaker, this thing is so patently ridiculous and absurd that I hesitate even to attribute it to this government. I suspect, sir, that this is the result of pressure from somewhere else. I suspect that this is the result of pressure from a place where a considerable measure of hysteria is prevailing at the present time, and that our government is doing this to reassure people somewhere else outside of Canada that if at some time these people discover someone on one of the lake boats, one who took part in a peace rally, a May-day parade or, like the Minister of Justice, sat on the platform with a Soviet representative, the government of Canada will be prepared by regulation to cut off his head and take him off that ship.

I cannot see that there can be any other explanation for this ridiculous and fantastic piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, which in the first place gives to this government the power to create crimes, to say that this shall be a crime. If they are going to be able to do this by order in council, what are they going to constitute as a crime tomorrow? Perhaps they will constitute as a crime the saying of rude things that are said about the Liberal government of Canada, and there will be an awful lot of us in the penitentiary.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government had better tell anybody who is bringing pressure on them that we have our own methods of safeguarding our way of life in Canada; that we are not impressed with the methods employed in other places; that reasonable precautions are taken and that we are still able to look after our own affairs in this country, because otherwise the only explanation that I have—it is not an explanation—the only explanation I have is that this government has gone slightly daft.

**Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to almost all of this debate, and as yet I have not heard any explanation satisfactory to myself why parliament should be asked to make suspected wrongful thinking an offence on the great lakes. This is the first time that parliament has been asked to create a territorial offence. I think it is a dangerous course of action and one that indicates that what the government is trying to do is to bring legislation into effect, allegedly for the security of Canada, while afraid to face the issue and place that legislation before parliament.

I cannot agree that parliament should be asked to grant these comprehensive rights asked for under this bill whereby the governor in council will be authorized to have undesignated powers to do undefined things