

from the Minister of Immigration or the Minister of Justice. Can the minister give us any information about this despatch?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I again tell my hon. friend that he takes too much for granted from the newspapers. If he asks what authority Colonel Price had for saying this, that or the other thing, I do not know what he did say. All I know about this is what I read in the Ottawa papers this morning. I understand what took place at Sudbury occurred under instructions of the Attorney General of Ontario and was carried out through the provincial police, although I have been informed that some of our police were called in to assist. We have not as yet any report on the matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What will be the procedure now?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would gather from the newspaper report that Colonel Price thinks this is a proper case for deportation. If it is, he will have to follow the provisions of the Immigration Act, which provides for an investigation and a report to the minister before a man can be deported.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): In the first remarks the minister made, he spoke about a board of inquiry at Halifax that was to inquire into this case. Will he give the committee more information about the board? Are its members permanent officials of the department? How and by whom are they appointed or selected?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Some of them are permanent officials. I think they are all selected by the minister. I have not the Immigration Act before me, and I am not familiar with it.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): Do they go from place to place as they are required?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I fancy they go from place to place as they may be required, but there are at the various ports permanent officials who are asked to act in these cases.

Mr. GERSHAW: I notice this appropriation includes \$50,000 for services in connection with the administration of the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. I am aware the officers have done splendid work during the past few years in controlling the sale of banned drugs in this country. I notice the appropriation has been reduced by \$10,000. Is the department doing anything in the way of providing treatment or special hospitals for drug addicts?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. The Justice department takes no part in the provision of hospitals or treatment. I would think that would be a matter rather for the provinces than for the federal government. It may be that the Health department gives some grant or does something in the matter, but if so it is not within my knowledge. This vote is merely to cover the expenses of the mounted police in running down traffickers in narcotic drugs. I am inclined to think from my experience in the Justice department, and also in the courts of the country before I came to the department, that the drug traffic is not on the decline in Canada. Case after case comes from all parts of Canada. There were three this afternoon, all from British Columbia. There are a great many cases, far too many, and the department and the police are using their best endeavours to check the traffic as far as possible. Whether or not it is possible absolutely to abolish it I do not know. It is very difficult to run down these drug traffickers, and it is an expensive part of our work. Evidently they are well financed and are able to obtain very good legal counsel when they come up for trial. I have no doubt that there is a strong financial ring behind the traffic as it exists in this country and also in other countries. The mounted police expend a great deal of effort under this particular item, but it was thought that we would try to get along with \$10,000 less than was appropriated last year, not because the traffic has decreased, but because of the need for economy.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I for a moment revert to the subject under discussion a few moments ago, the question of the seizing of individuals by the police and their removal, with an expedition almost unequalled outside of Russia, I take it, down to some distant province or port in this country. I would ask the minister first of all whether action of that kind does not deprive the individual of the opportunity of having his counsel apply for and effect habeas corpus. Secondly I would ask the minister, if he can, to justify the action that has been taken. I do not think as a matter of fact that I have yet heard even an attempt to justify it. The minister did suggest that under the Immigration Act anyone who felt aggrieved might be able to take appropriate action to have investigation. I have at the moment no complaint to make of the administration of the act in the past. I have on several occasions had to deal with the Department of Immigration, both to have men deported at