

due process of law or that the rights which ordinarily British subjects heretofore possessed have been taken away. But I do point out, Mr. Speaker, that all over this dominion fears are being expressed by loyal and patriotic British citizens and subjects that certain persons have been interned who ought not to have been interned. In making that statement, I am merely expressing an argument that is being advanced on every hand to-day. I do not suggest in the least that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) is not fairly discharging the responsibilities of his position. The point I make is that the argument is being advanced that all is not well. That sort of thing engenders fear, and fear results in disunity within the country.

Some argument has been advanced that these regulations, not having been passed by parliament or debated by parliament in detail, as a consequence have been foisted on the people of this country, if I may use that expression. In my view, that argument is not well founded. Last year the government brought before parliament a resolution calling for the creation of a committee of parliament to look into the situation and determine what regulations, if any, should be instituted or what amendments should be made. The committee that was set up, composed of members of all parties in this house, in the main agreed on the recommendations that were brought in. The committee's recommendations were brought before parliament by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who acted as chairman of the committee. A debate took place in the house with reference to these regulations in general, and particularly with reference to the question of the liberty of the subject being infringed upon.

There is only one section of the regulations with which I intend to deal this evening, and I am doing this only with a view to placing before the committee a suggestion which I think will remove a major portion of the objections which are being advanced to-day against the defence of Canada regulations as they now exist. Section 21 provides:

The Minister of Justice, if satisfied that with a view to preventing any particular person from acting in any manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state it is necessary to do so, may, notwithstanding anything in these regulations, make an order:

(c) directing that he be detained in such place, and under such conditions, as the Minister of Justice may from time to time determine.

I see no objection to this section as it stands. The discretion is vested in the Min-

ister of Justice and he has given his explanation as to the circumstances under which that discretion is exercised.

I come now to the section which I think does cause considerable difficulty, section 22, which reads:

For the purposes of the preceding regulation the Minister of Justice may appoint one or more advisory committees, each such committee to consist of a person who holds or has held high judicial office.

Section 26, which deals with the recommendations made from time to time by the committees so constituted reads:

Nothing in the preceding regulations shall prevent the Minister of Justice from ordering the release of any enemy alien from arrest, detention or internment, or from ordering the arrest, detention or internment of any enemy alien.

I am not now discussing the question of enemy aliens; I am discussing the question of British subjects. I think much of the alarm that has been aroused among certain people throughout this country against these regulations would be entirely allayed if provision were made for the setting up of a committee of review consisting not of one judge but of three judges, two superior court judges and the county or district court judge presiding over the court in the judicial district within which the internee was living at the time of his internment. A certain discretion must rest with the Minister of Justice; and I say here without equivocation that in my opinion no one in this dominion has anything to fear so long as the present Minister of Justice remains the incumbent of the position which he now occupies. I think it only fair to make that statement. Many people, however, believe that there is too much power concentrated in the hands of one man in the determination of the incarceration of British subjects in custody under the regulations.

The last speaker referred to the fact that there were some who said the defence of Canada regulations were to be exercised for the purpose of coercion. That I do not believe. I suggest, however, that many of the objections thereto would be done away with, in so far as British subjects are concerned, by setting up this judicial committee of three persons. It was said the other day that judges are not overworked, and that they have more leisure time than they used to have because of the falling off of litigation in recent months and years. Judges are available therefore to undertake this work, and by utilizing their services we would do away with unnecessary delays which sometimes occur before the hearing of appeals of interned persons. To-day one man exercises the dis-