

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): That is the country where they try to get Italian fascists out of the internment camps.

Mr. BRADETTE: They do that because they are innocent. I wish the hon. member to withdraw what he has said. I went before the courts of this country, and the man was proved to have been innocent. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I made no charge, and I do not propose to withdraw my statement.

Mr. BRADETTE: The hon. member imputed motives.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the statement; but if the hon. member did impute motives, then he will have to withdraw his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I imputed no motives and made no charge.

Mr. BRADETTE: Yes, the hon. member did. He said I went before the courts fighting for some people who I knew were fascists.

An hon. MEMBER: No; he did not.

Mr. BRADETTE: I want those words to be withdrawn. I am just as good a Canadian as is the hon. member.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I think *Hansard* will support what I say.

The point I was making was this, that at the time we profess to be fighting a battle in the interests of Christian principles, we are allowing organizations and sects which may not be popular in this country—

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): I doubt very much if the hon. member is a Christian, although he preaches Christianity.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It may not be a very large section of our public; but we are banning these organizations, without giving them any opportunity to defend themselves. We are merely saying to them, "You are illegal organizations," and we say to the individual, "If you continue as a member of this organization you render yourself capable of punishment by law."

We believe the regulations ought to be altered so as to give those people an opportunity of appearing before some judicial or quasi-judicial body, so that they may state their case and have a hearing. That is the very least we can give to any organization or individual.

I have one further word to say, and it has to do with money belonging to organizations which have been declared illegal. I made reference to one of them the other day.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

I understand the money in such an organization is turned over to the custodian of enemy property. That seems to me a most unfair procedure, particularly if some of the funds of such an organization happen to belong to the rank and file of the people. I have in mind a man who some years ago lent a considerable sum of money to the sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): He made a poor investment.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The loan was made long before that sect was considered an illegal organization. They were paying him back at the rate of so much a month, or on what might be described as an annuity basis. Along came the war, and the organization was declared to be illegal. Its funds, amounting to \$75,000, were seized and turned over to the custodian of enemy property. What is the position of that individual? What crime has he committed?

The Minister of Justice said a moment ago that he made a poor investment. Probably he did make a poor investment; but why is he to be punished because the organization—

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): That was not a statement for publication.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am sorry.

Mr. CASSELMAN (Grenville-Dundas): It was under your breath.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Why is this man to be punished because the organization to which he lent money has been banned by the Minister of Justice? Surely that is most unfair. That money goes to the custodian of enemy property. But the man who lent the money is not an enemy; he is a Canadian citizen, born in Canada. He must, however, wait until the end of the war to get the money which he lent in good faith to an organization which had given him a written guarantee that it would pay him back at the rate of so much a month.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He will know something about the law of delays before he gets his money.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): And he may know some privation before he gets it, too.

I submit that in studying these regulations the committee ought to give serious consideration to matters of this kind. Ever since the war began, we in this group have insisted not that the laws of this country be made easier for saboteurs and fifth columnists, but that they should be made harder for such people. No country can be too hard on any man or woman who, having accepted the pro-