

in Canada. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, the other day, addressing the Minister of Justice, said: "If you are looking for subversive elements, don't keep always in the gutter". Let me ask hon. members who are denouncing the regulations and their administration: Do those things that have been done, things which are known to us here to-night, indicate that the Minister of Justice and those working with him are looking in the gutter? Was it in the gutter that they found Mr. Camillien Houde, a member of the legislature of Quebec, a former leader of a political party in that province and, at the moment of his detention, mayor of the largest city in Canada? Was it in the gutter that they found the great Italian patriot Mr. Franceschini when he was put in the internment camp? Petitions have been signed, I understand, asking for the release of this gentleman. My hon. friends should talk about looking in the gutter or above it to those who are making these demands upon the Minister of Justice asking him to release some people who are detained purely because those who are responsible for administering the regulations, those who are responsible for the safety of Canada, feel that it is in the interests of the country that these men should remain in detention.

I am going to deal now not with the regulations themselves but with the nature of the attacks made upon the regulations. I have here the speech mentioned to-night by the hon. member for Weyburn. He said that nobody in this house had ever taken exception to any of the speeches made by the member for North Battleford. I have here a speech on the budget delivered at the last session on July 2. It will be found at page 1263 of *Hansard*. The hon. member for North Battleford spoke on that occasion and I wish to give one or two quotations.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Did the hon. member attack them at the time as subversive?

Mr. TURGEON: I never did. My hon. friend says that this particular group has never opposed the defence of Canada regulations.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I did not say anything of the kind. I said that we have never opposed the idea of having regulations.

Mr. TURGEON: I say that the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation did oppose the idea of having defence of Canada regulations, that they opposed the idea of the proclamation of the War Measures Act; and the Cooperative Commonwealth party in British Columbia—

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Two different things.

Mr. TURGEON: The defence of Canada regulations find their very root in the War Measures Act. My hon. friend knows that; and yet that group, he says, have never opposed the regulations in principle. I say that they have opposed the regulations in principle and opposed the statute upon which they are based.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I must correct the hon. gentleman. At no time have I said that we never opposed the defence of Canada regulations. My party never at any time opposed the idea of having regulations for the defence of Canada, but we contended that they should be passed by this parliament and not by order in council under the War Measures Act.

Mr. TURGEON: I do not like to do this, but I have here a copy of the *Federationist*, which my hon. friend will admit is the organ of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in British Columbia. It is for March, 1940, and it is headed, "Cariboo Edition". On the front page there is an article by William Irvine who is a member of the national council of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. Under his own by-line on the front page of the Cariboo edition of the *Federationist* he says: "A vote for Mr. Turgeon is a vote for the padlock law"—I do not know where he got that—"and for the War Measures Act". What has my friend to say about that?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Opposition to using the War Measures Act whereby orders in council can be brought down putting into effect regulations that parliament has never seen is totally different from being opposed to any type of regulation to defend the realm.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): The defence of Canada regulations were passed when he made that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Yes, and they were passed by order in council under the War Measures Act and this parliament never saw them except indirectly.

Mr. TURGEON: The hon. member and other members of his group, time after time, rise in their places and state that the whole objective of the regulations is labour. They sometimes apply it to the British Labour party, and then they talk of labour in general. I have just read to the house a formal resolution passed last September by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada with regard to the defence of Canada regulations, and