

tantamount to a scandal. That man has had a hearing before an advisory committee in Fredericton. During the last session I requested the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) to table all documents pertaining to that hearing. My request was turned down. Mr. Camillien Houde has asked the department of justice for a typewritten copy of the evidence he gave at that hearing.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is speaking of a matter which does not come under this item at all. He is speaking with regard to the rights and wrongs of the internment of an individual who happens to be in an internment camp, which is a matter that does not come within my jurisdiction. All that is covered by this item is the guarding of those in these camps. The Department of National Defence has nothing to do with the question of the merits or the reasons for internment. My department provides the buildings, the establishment, the administration and the guards, and I think my hon. friend is out of order in discussing that matter on this item.

Mr. LACOMBE: I submit respectfully that I am discussing internment operations, and that I am in order in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has raised a proper objection. We are dealing with internment operations, and this item has nothing to do with the Department of National Defence. What I have heard discussed so far by the hon. member is a matter which pertains to the Department of Justice, so that I would ask him to abstain from discussing that subject under this item.

Mr. LACOMBE: I respect your decision, Mr. Chairman, and I shall have occasion to speak of this question later.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. The only reason why I mention it in the committee is that it involves a principle and I should like to know what is being done about it. This is the case of an officer and his wife who have rented a house in the city of Toronto for nine and a half years. The owner of the house died, the property was sold by a trust company and later resold to a woman whose husband is living. She is the owner of the house, though her husband actually put up the money. This officer is in the 48th Highlanders. He joined in January, 1940, and went overseas in August of that year. He was wounded and invalided to Malta but is back with his unit again in Italy. As I say, these two people have lived in this house for nine and a half years. It is their home; it is

what he is fighting for. He wants to come back to that home, and if he is lucky he will do so, but now his wife has been given notice to vacate.

The man who brought this matter to my attention has spoken to the husband of the owner, but this man has shown no sympathy whatever. Quite frankly he said that they had bought the place so that they would have a more comfortable home in which to live. When it was pointed out that there was a certain amount of uncertainty in connection with the service of this officer he simply replied that this woman was quite capable of buying a home of her own, which is not the case, and he further went on to say, "Well, he might be killed by an automobile any day." This man and his wife have bought this house in order that they may be a little more comfortable, and for that reason are going to turn out this soldier's wife who has made her home there for the past nine and a half years.

There must be some process that can be followed which would give protection to our soldiers who are overseas, and I would ask the minister if something cannot be done in cases of this kind. Surely there should be some protection for that woman whose husband is overseas fighting for us, fighting for the man who bought that house, the man who is going to take possession of the house because he and his wife want to be a little more comfortable. There must be some appeal from the rental control regulations of the wartime prices and trade board. I shall be glad to give the minister the particulars of this case; I do not want to read the letter because I do not desire to bring personalities into the discussion, but surely something can be done to protect that home.

Mr. RALSTON: On a number of occasions, in dealing with the matter of housing for soldiers, I have indicated that the dependents' allowance is paid for the purpose of putting the wife and family in funds to pay rent or meet any other expenses.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to finish. I have indicated that the department and indeed the federal government have not undertaken to provide housing. I have indicated more than once that this is considered to be a municipal and provincial responsibility, and my hon. friend's appeal would be more properly directed to those authorities. The hon. gentleman asks whether something can be done, but this is a