

were commenced in the district in which the person resided. This is an entirely new procedure.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I want to know why this was done in this case and in the case of the Sudbury people, about which I only know what I have seen, and what I presume the minister has seen, in the newspapers. The two cases appear to be similar; there seems to have been a spiriting away from the locality in which the arrests were made, and I am informed that there was a similar case in Edmonton. It seems amazing that in this year 1932, either this ministry or the Department of Immigration should become so terribly obsessed with fear as to be driven to this hysterical method of trying to cope with what they appear to regard as a gigantic national danger. I do not see that they are getting anywhere by magnifying cases of this kind into major national problems. I tell you frankly, Mr. Chairman, words fail me; I cannot possibly find the proper language with which to describe these actions. But there is one thing I think the minister should tell us: Why, in these cases should the whole course of procedure be altered from the regular, constitutional, civilized methods of British justice which have been followed in the past? The minister says there is a law which permits the Immigration department to take this action. That law has never before been invoked to this degree, at least not to my knowledge. If the minister knows of any similar cases I should be glad to hear of them. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, the action taken has deprived men of the opportunity of securing a decent trial and obtaining justice in their own locality.

May I make a suggestion, because I think the minister is quite sincere and does not want to contravene the popular conception of British justice. Let the minister have these men returned to Winnipeg; let their counsel have an opportunity of invoking habeas corpus proceedings, if they can secure the writs. Let the men have a fair trial, and let the law take its proper course. That is the least we can ask the minister to do, especially in the case of this man who is married to a Canadian woman.

Mr. EULER: When I heard the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre recite the facts of this matter as given in the newspapers, with regard to the taking of these men from Winnipeg and from Sudbury to Halifax in order to be tried, it seemed to me a most

[Mr. W. F. Garland.]

amazing statement. I do not think anyone will accuse me of in any way encouraging sedition or violence, or of being a communist; but it is not even the appearance of justice to arrest a man at his place of residence and take him to a point two or three thousand miles distant in order that he may be tried, thus depriving him of the ordinary opportunity that should be given every man to defend himself. It may not be true that this was done; there may be an explanation which the minister cannot give to-day. But knowing the minister as I do I am sure he does not approve of what was done, if indeed it was done as it has been described in the newspapers and by the hon. members who have spoken. The minister says he is quite certain that the law has been observed and that any action taken is within the law. If this is true, and this is the law, I suggest to the minister and to the government that it is time the law was changed. I think it only fair—and this should be secured by law—that when a man is arrested for any reason whatever, whether it be on a charge of murder or any other heinous offence, he should, at least, have the right of trial in his own community, unless it is impossible for him to receive a fair trial there.

I should like to refer also to the subject mentioned by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, that is, the preventive service. Perhaps this question would be better asked of the Minister of National Revenue; it is difficult to say where the question of the transfer of the preventive service should be discussed. I heard the minister say a moment ago that the land forces of the preventive service, formerly attached to the Department of National Revenue, were to be transferred to the mounted police. We knew that. I was not aware, however, that the sea forces were also to be transferred. I presume that explains a statement made the other day which seemed to me inaccurate. The minister stated that some 350 men of the former preventive service were being taken into the mounted police and that some 250 men were being let out. My recollection is that there were not 600 men in the preventive service when I was in the Department of National Revenue.

I should like to ask whether, with the taking over of these men of the preventive service, there now will be within the mounted police a special branch to which shall be assigned those special duties formerly carried out by the preventive service of the Department of National Revenue, or whether the officers of the preventive service are merely incorporated