

the nazi and fascist powers must take every necessary step to prevent itself from being honeycombed by those inside who would cause our people to lose faith in themselves and in one another and in our democratic way of life. We in this group have never at any time objected to there being defence of Canada regulations. The Minister of Justice knows that quite well. What we have objected to is, first, that the procedure set out for taking steps against persons who are enemies of the state is not such as to safeguard and protect the civil liberties of our people; and, second, that these regulations are so vague in their terminology as to make it possible, as I think I can show, for discrimination to be shown against innocent persons.

The minister made an impassioned speech the other day. He said that he was only doing his duty and that as long as he holds the position he now holds he would do his duty according to the regulations given to him by parliament. I suggest that parliament has never had an opportunity to review those regulations. It is true that a small committee of parliament went over them last year and made some recommendations as to changes, but even that report was not a unanimous one, and parliament itself did not pass those regulations and has had no suitable opportunity to discuss them or place them on the statute books as representing the opinion of the people of Canada in general.

Our objection is not to the regulations but to the fact that the procedure is not clearly outlined and that there are loopholes so that the people are not properly safeguarded. Those regulations lend themselves to being used, and have been used sometimes, to repress criticism, to put out of the way people who perhaps were a nuisance to someone, and to take steps against people who perhaps were not popular in certain quarters.

I enjoyed the speech made by the minister the other evening on the appropriation bill. He gave three reasons why this country was fighting; I think every hon. member agreed with him. The first was individual freedom; the second, freedom of national groups to develop their culture and traditions, and the third, that we were fighting for the liberty of Christian faith. May I, however, suggest to the Minister of Justice that we are in danger of undermining some of these things right here in Canada. We cannot defend those things abroad unless we exercise eternal vigilance in preserving them at home.

Take the first, the freedom of the individual. Under these regulations we have taken from the private citizen of Canada something that has come to him or her down through the

centuries under British institutions, namely, the right of habeas corpus. We have taken from individuals the right to know why they are being detained; we have taken away the right of a newspaper to know why it is suppressed, the right of an organization to know why it has been declared illegal and banned. Even in Great Britain, where they were much closer to the vortex of the war last summer than we, where the danger from the large number of refugees who had filtered in from the European continent was much more real, they have not gone as far as we have in taking away the right of habeas corpus. May I read part of regulation 21 and compare it with the analogous British regulation:

21. (1) 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 so to do, 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.

The British regulation corresponding to that is No. 18B. This is a regulation which the British parliament insisted upon. Although they had had a regulation similar to the one we have, they would not stand for it. Their regulation reads:

18B. (1) If the Secretary of State has reasonable cause to believe any person to be of hostile origin or association or to have been recently concerned in acts prejudicial to the public safety or the defence of the realm or in the preparation or instigation of such acts and that by reason thereof it is necessary to exercise control over him, he may make an order against that person directing that he be detained.

In other words, they have there a regulation by which those ordering a man's detention must show cause why he is detained, and he must have done something, recently, prejudicial to the state or must be of alien origin or association.

This is a most serious matter. I do not know to what extent the Minister of Justice is familiar with just how this is applied in some parts of the country, but on November 28 last, I drew the attention of this house to the case of a man named Florian Stephan of Regina. Since it is on *Hansard* I shall not go back over the case in detail, but there have been some developments since. This man was a member of the executive of the relief recipients' organization. The relief committee of the Regina city council offered to meet the executive of the relief recipients. They met in a room, just a committee from the council and a committee from the relief recipients and a couple of representatives from