

tive member of the house. They have put into internment camps men in high places, because they know that the real danger to democratic institutions in Great Britain came not from below but from those in high places who could use their influence to defeat the aims of the common people. Such statements, for example, as were made by Senator Meighen at a public function in Toronto or in another place, are subversive statements, among the most subversive I have seen. The statement in the *Ottawa Citizen* is more dangerously subversive than anything I have seen in any so-called radical or communist paper published in Canada.

I support the setting up of this committee and the broad reference made to it. But I feel it is my duty to take this opportunity of laying before this House of Commons the dangers which I see in the present regulations and their administration.

I should like to quote the material part of the resolution which was seconded by Sir Percy Harris, the Liberal member to whom I referred. It was moved by Mr. Bevan, a Labour member of the house. In part the resolution uses these words, which express my idea exactly:

That this house expresses its detestation of the propaganda of the *Daily Worker*—

That was the communist newspaper in England.

—in relation to the war, as it is convinced that the future of democratic institutions and the expanding welfare of the people everywhere depend on the successful prosecution of the war till fascism is finally defeated; but is of the opinion that the confidence of considerable numbers of people can be undermined if it can be shown to them that any newspaper can be suppressed in a manner which leaves that newspaper no chance of stating its case—

That which applies to a newspaper applies equally to an individual.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Has my hon. friend read the speech of Mr. Herbert Morrison?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes; and I would agree with his characterization of the *Daily Worker* and its propaganda; but I say that in this country it is a blot on our democracy that the only information given to people who are detained under regulation 21 is that which I quoted once before:

Your detention has been deemed necessary in the interests of the state because representations have been made that you are a member of the communist party of Canada, a subversive organization which is opposed to the interests of Canada. In view of this, it would appear that you are disloyal to Canada.

That, I say, is insufficient evidence upon which an accused person may contest any case.

Just before I sit down I should like to refer to the suspension of the *Canadian Tribune*, in regard to which I have received a number of telegrams. I understand that this newspaper has been suspended simply on verbal notice from the police.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I may tell my hon. friend that regular notice was duly served on that newspaper on February 25, after verbal notice had been given.

Mr. COLDWELL: I had no knowledge of that fact. I am glad to hear the Secretary of State (Mr. Casgrain) make that statement, and perhaps a little later he will have something further to say about the matter. It seems to me, however, that when a newspaper is suspended we should know the reasons for that suspension; whether or not it was guilty of some contravention of the law and in what particular, and why, if it was guilty of a contravention of the law, it was not taken into court. In contrast may I suggest that if the *Financial Post* has been the number one saboteur, surely it should have been proceeded against as was the *Canadian Tribune*; and if the statement I have quoted from the *Ottawa Citizen*—and that was a correct statement from the editorial—having been brought to the attention of the authorities, was subversive, as I believe it was, then some action should have been taken in that regard. If we are going to have regulations let them be administered impartially, without regard to who breaks the regulations. Then we shall feel that at least an attempt at justice is being made.

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, may I say first that in the task which is mine, that of exercising a discretion which at times is far from pleasant, I am merely doing the work that has been entrusted to me by parliament, and more particularly by a committee which last year sat especially for the purpose of considering and revising these regulations. I was not a member of the committee. I intentionally refrained from being a member, in order that the decisions of the committee should not be influenced in any way by what I might have to say. Neither will I be a member of the committee which is to be appointed under the resolution now before the house. I will do my duty if, when that committee reports, new regulations are enacted amending the old ones. I will apply those regulations with calm, with deliberation, with circumspection; but I will apply them, whatever may be the criticism.