

off on somebody else. He in his person has the custody of our survival and our security. In the views he has placed before the house he has been given the benefit of the study that was made by dedicated public servants whose purpose was to assure that justice shall be done. *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*—"Let justice be done though the heavens should fall".

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Chairman, may I say at once that we in this party welcome the statement that has been made by the Prime Minister. We believe it represents a step forward in dealing with an extremely important and very difficult subject. We believe that the statement constitutes a recognition of the very grave hardships done to individuals by the mistaken application of security procedures. I think that this recognition no doubt owes something to the liberal—and I use the word with a small "l"—tendencies of the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues. I should also like to say that it owes a good deal to the vigilance and effectiveness of the members of the house who, despite official discouragement from time to time have insisted on bringing this matter and individual cases to the attention of the house. I think, for example, of the Knott case where, if it had not been for the persistence of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands the case would have died on the files and a young man dismissed or discharged from the navy in the mistaken belief that his uncle was a communist, as though that had anything to do with the matter. While we welcome this statement we have serious reservations about the effectiveness of the methods and the tribunal which is proposed. Our basic criticism is that this tribunal remains an internal tribunal. It is not a judicial tribunal.

The Prime Minister has given reasons why the government decided not to have a quasi-judicial tribunal, and I acknowledge at once that the ordinary method of appeal and trial is not suitable to the determination of security cases where it is impossible to confront the person affected with all the information. But, Mr. Chairman, I know of a precedent which was adopted in wartime which I suggest could and should have been adopted here. During the war the minister of justice, acting under the powers conferred by the War Measures Act and the defence of Canada regulations, found it necessary to intern quite a large number of individuals, sometimes on mere suspicion. After public representation it was found possible to set up a tribunal, which was not a tribunal of civil servants or department heads or within the structure of government, but included, as I recall it, a member of the judiciary who was free, and bound to be free, from the

necessity to consider the internal or departmental matters and who was able to apply a clear judicial judgment to the problems which came before him. Security, of course, prevented the disclosure by the minister of justice of that day of the details and sources of information against the internees, but the outline of the case was disclosed. The internee had the opportunity to give to this independent tribunal his side of the case, and as a result of that many persons were let out of the internment camps and a continuing injustice was remedied. If this can be done in wartime, Mr. Chairman, I ask why a similar quasi-judicial tribunal cannot be set up in peacetime, when the jobs and reputations of Canadians are secretly filched from them by the present procedures we adopt.

There are other reservations in our minds as to the announcement which has been made. For example, we are concerned whether the protection is extensive enough. Most members of this house are familiar with the large number of cases of refusal of citizenship, of refusal to allow otherwise qualified persons into the country, relatives of people who are here now; and the very same secretive type of proceedings are adopted whereby they are denied any knowledge of the nature of the case made against them.

As I read this statement it applies to government agencies, but this problem extends far beyond that. These procedures apparently do not apply to the services at all; yet the most notorious case in this field which has been brought to the attention of this parliament was the case of a man discharged from the navy. There are also other bodies and corporations working on security matters who are also given information, and people discharged in such cases lose their jobs and their reputations, and their future is endangered in precisely the same manner as those who are actually discharged from the government service.

While we welcome this statement, we think there are many other questions which should be asked, and I will just mention a few of them. What about the training of the people who do this particularly delicate and difficult security task? I do not know what the training is, but from the results which occur I suggest it is not good enough. I have nothing against the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as a force. I echo, though not with the same eloquence, the tribute paid by the Leader of the Opposition to that force. But in this sensitive field of security I do not believe that the police, including the R.C.M.P., are trained in that delicate political judgment which is necessary to prevent them from making mistakes, and we only know a very small and