

*Defence Production Act*

program is, I venture to say, proceeding according to plan and as fast as possible.

This act still has another year to go. I should like to see what the hon. member for Calgary North suggested, this bill withdrawn and a new bill brought back next year if it is necessary to have some powers. The bill could be drawn in two parts, so that an assurance would be given to the personnel of the Department of Defence Production that they are not going to be thrown out in one or two years. In the other part of the bill the powers could be limited; and when the time runs out, whatever minister is in charge of this department could come before parliament, and I do not think he would have to worry about having those powers granted, if they were needed. All he would have to do would be to show this house that they were needed.

I think that has been borne out in the last seven or eight years. Whenever the government come to parliament and ask for money for defence or something of that nature, they get it. That is good evidence that there is confidence in the minister who is running the department. But where we have no confidence is in the fact that the next minister who is operating under this law may not operate as well in using these powers. That is the principle involved.

Hon. members should give a little serious thought to this matter. This is not an emergency, and I do not think anything would happen if this act did not pass this year. I am satisfied that the officials of the Department of Justice and the minister's assistants can draft an act that will be acceptable, that will not be dangerous and that will protect the personnel of the Department of Defence Production.

After all, I am satisfied that that is what this legislation is for, more than anything else; because in explaining it the Prime Minister spent more time on that and gave a full explanation, because it was a sound ground. I do not consider that the explanations or the grounds are sound upon which we have been asked to repeal section 41 of this act. In all sincerity I do not see how I could support this bill, although there are some things about it which I can support.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, in the past two days I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on second reading of this bill. I hope I shall not be charged with political heresy for what I am going to say, but after listening to all the debate and especially the remarks made by the hon. members who are a part of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, I feel it is time

[Mr. Montgomery.]

this was said. We are all elected here as members of parliament, but we are the representatives of parties. That is according to our custom and perhaps as it should be. Having been elected here to the House of Commons, although we are members of certain parties which stand by certain principles and philosophies and programs, we in this house as members have responsibilities which are somewhat changed upon election.

I believe it is absolutely wrong and not in the interests of parliamentary democracy if a party which has the control of government completely ignores all suggestions and recommendations from the parties in opposition, just because the parties are in opposition. On the same basis, it is absolutely wrong for members of the House of Commons in opposition to oppose anything introduced by the government just because it comes from the government and we are in the opposition. It is because of that feeling that I said I hoped I would not be charged with political heresy. I think it is wrong for the government to ignore all suggestions that come from the opposition, and I also think it is definitely wrong for the opposition in any or all parties to oppose a measure just because it is introduced by the government.

After listening to this discussion which has taken place over the past two days, and in particular what has been said by the members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition on my right, I am afraid they are opposing this measure for one reason only, namely that it is a measure introduced by the government.

**Mr. Churchill:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Winch:** My friend here says "nuts".

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order. I said "nonsense".

**Mr. Winch:** That is my impression. That is my opinion. I say it does not make for a good parliament for members to oppose measures just because they are in the opposition.

In my brief time here in Ottawa I have at times thought the Minister of Defence Production, especially as Minister of Trade and Commerce, was wrong in some of his policies and in some of his decisions. Once in a while I think he is wrong in his decisions as Minister of Defence Production. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all, standing in my place here in the opposition, in saying that if this group, the C.C.F., were over there on the opposite side on the government benches, and if in an emergency a job had to be done and red tape had to be ignored, if I had anything to say—and I do not mind saying this—I would ask a man by the name