

The pamphlets consisted, I understand, of extracts from speeches made by the hon. member in this house.

Last Wednesday the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) stated that the commissioner never intended to say anything that would reflect on the rights and duties of members of parliament. We in this house have certain rights and privileges, which we should guard jealously. It may be that in this article there was no reflection upon members of parliament, but the seizure of pamphlets circulated by the hon. member for North Battleford, and being simply extracts from speeches she made in this house, is a serious interference with the privileges of this house and this parliament which ought not to be tolerated by the members of this house, no matter where they sit. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is for you to judge whether an hon. member transgresses or exceeds his rights here, and not for the mounted police.

Having placed this matter before you I am asking that it be given some consideration. At the same time I ask the Minister of Justice, when he has time, to explain this action to the house.

Now compare the statements of the hon. member for North Battleford with statements that were made, let us say, in the *Ottawa Citizen* of January 11. That paper contained a long editorial entitled "At the Business End of the Bren." The concluding words were these:

When the lads come home from overseas after some years of service at the real business end of the Bren gun, they may know better where to shoot than Canadian veterans did in the years of debt and privation after the last war.

Was there ever a clearer case of incitement to men in uniform when they return from overseas to use force to obtain what they were after? I believe in the freedom of the press and freedom of speech, but the government adopted regulations under which men have been prosecuted and interned for far less than this. Justice, if it is to be justice, must be impartial. What has been done by the attorney general of Canada, to whose attention I drew this editorial, or by the attorney general of Ontario, whose attention I have reason to believe was also drawn to it by someone else?

Yesterday we had the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) tell us in the house that a newspaper, the *Financial Post*, was number one saboteur in Canada.

Mr. TURGEON: When the minister said that was he speaking of sabotage against Canada or against H. R. MacMillan?

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. COLDWELL: I understood he was speaking of Canada, because he said that that paper right from the beginning had endeavoured to stop the production of Bren guns. That was long before Mr. MacMillan was connected with the department.

Mr. TURGEON: I think when he made that statement about sabotage he was referring to Mr. MacMillan.

Mr. COLDWELL: I hold no brief for any of the papers that have been suppressed; I hold no brief for the *Canadian Tribune*, which has been suppressed this week, but I agree with the Right Hon. Sir Percy Harris, of Bethnal Green South West division, a Liberal member of the British house, who when two communist papers were recently suppressed in Great Britain made this statement when he seconded the amendment condemning that suppression:

It would be a very bad day for parliament and democracy if a paper could be closed down without discussion in the House of Commons.

Yet these things are being done without the knowledge or consent of this house.

I believe that the greatest threat to a successful conclusion of this war does not come from the discredited communist party, which has been revealed in its true colours as the agent of a foreign power, but from persons in high places who fear the progressive aspirations of the common people more than they fear the thing we call fascism. Was not that the story of France, and of the traitorous conduct of influential people in other fallen nations?

What I have said to-day ought to be said. The danger to democracy and progress is within our gates as well as without. And we are looking in the wrong places for the most dangerous subversive influences, I submit. When our mounted police turn their eyes to seek those who sympathize with the dictatorships, let them look above the gutter and the beer parlour, then perhaps they will find where the real danger to our democratic institutions lies.

There are subtle ways of defeating our cause. In Britain they know for what they fight. There they do not fear the so-called radical; they fear more those who through the years looked to Hitler as their protection against the will of the people. In support of that statement let me say it is significant that in Great Britain they have not bothered with the communist leaders, indeed they have only just lately suppressed the communist daily newspaper. But they have put in an internment camp a member of parliament—not a Labour or a communist member, a Conserva-