

3. Through the agency of what merchants, and for what amounts in each case, was the distribution made?

4. What are the names and the amounts paid in each case to the fishermen of Grosses-Roches, Ste-Felicite, Matane, Riviere Blanche, Baie-des-Sables, Les Boules, Metic, Grand Metis and Ste. Flavie?

5. What are the names of the fishermen in each of the parishes aforesaid who received deficiency payments through the medium of the salt fish board during the years 1939 and 1940, and what amount was paid in each case?

6. What was the total amount paid by the salt fish board, and by the government, to the fishermen of the above county during the said years?

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—REGINA EMPLOYEES

Mr. PERLEY:

1. How many office employees are there in the city of Regina under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act?

2. What are their names, home addresses, positions, salaries and expenses, respectively?

3. How many have been employed under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act since the 1st of July last, (a) in field service; (b) inspectors, (c) supervisors; and what are the names, home addresses and salaries and expenses, respectively, of these persons?

THETFORD MINES, QUE., MILITARY TRAINING CAMP

Mr. LAFONTAINE:

1. During the year 1940 were any requests made to the government for the establishment of a military training camp at Thetford Mines, county of Megantic-Frontenac?

2. If so, by whom were these requests made, when, and for what reasons were they not granted?

DEFENCE OF CANADA

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AND REVIEW REGULATIONS AND NATURALIZATION AND DEPORTATION LAWS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

Whereas order in council P.C. 2483 was passed under the authority of the War Measures Act on the 3rd September, 1939, making regulations known as the defence of Canada regulations:

And whereas the said regulations have been amended from time to time;

And whereas by order in council P.C. 4750 of the 12th September, 1940, the said regulations were revoked and the defence of Canada regulations (consolidation), 1940, numbered one to sixty-four inclusive, were made and established in substitution therefor;

And whereas since the 12th day of September, 1940, several orders in council have been passed amending, altering or adding to the said substituted regulations;

And whereas at the last session of parliament a select committee of this house was appointed on the 13th June, 1940, to consider and review the said defence of Canada regulations made on the 3rd September, 1939, and amendments thereto;

And whereas the said committee reported to this house on the 1st August, 1940, and amongst other things recommended, in effect, that at the next session of parliament a special committee of the house be appointed to again consider and review the defence of Canada regulations; to consider and review the law relating to naturalization and to review as well the law relating to deportation;

And whereas it is deemed advisable that a committee of the house be appointed accordingly to ascertain whether the defence of Canada regulations (consolidation), 1940, and amendments thereto and the law relating to naturalization and deportation reasonably meet the requirements of the country in time of war;

Therefore be it resolved that a select committee of this house consisting of the following members: Messrs. Bertrand (Laurier), Black (Yukon), Claxton, Coldwell, Dupuis, Hansell, Hanson (Skeena), Hazen, Martin, Maybank, McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River), Michaud, Ross (Calgary), Ross (Souris), Slaughter, be appointed to consider and review the defence of Canada regulations (consolidation), 1940, and amendments thereto, and the law relating to naturalization and to review as well the law relating to deportation; with power to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses under oath; and to report their opinions and observations from time to time to the house.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggart): Before the motion is adopted I should like to make a few observations regarding it.

I want to say at the outset that we welcome the appointment of this committee. A similar body was established last session. It met many times, and presented a report which was not moved at the time, and therefore not adopted. As one member of that committee who was not satisfied with all the recommendations made, I was disappointed that there was no opportunity for the discussion of the regulations and of the report before the regulations were further amended. I feel that, in their present form and under the present methods of their administration, many of our elementary democratic rights are being jeopardized.

Neither I nor any member of our group would suggest that subversive activities interfering with our success in the present struggle should be permitted or tolerated for a moment. On the other hand, we insist that every accused person, every accused organization, and—may I add—every accused newspaper ought to have the right of a proper hearing before an impartial and competent tribunal. Further, we believe that a decision from such an authority set up under the defence of Canada regulations at the present time should be equally binding upon the accused and upon the Department of Justice unless some further method of appeal to an impartial tribunal is provided. As the regulations now stand, this is not the case, as I shall try to show in a very few moments.