

suspicion, he should be interned for the safety of the state. He may be suspected, for instance, of blowing up a railway or setting fire to a camp or causing destruction to other property thus endangering the lives of a great many people. Proof may be impossible, yet the strongest suspicion points to him, and he should be interned.

The proof of the good administration of these regulations is in the result. One can take any criminal law upon our statute books and show this house that abuses have taken place under that law, but I have not heard very much in this house to convince me that the defence of Canada regulations have not been properly carried out. The names of two or three people have been mentioned, and it has been stated that some injustice has been done them, but I do not think that in any case this has been proved. As I said a moment or two ago, it is perhaps better that one or two men who have been indiscreet, perhaps, in their talk, if not in their actions, should suffer rather than that we should allow great damage to be done to this country in war time by allowing suspicious and dangerous men free for lack of proof.

With the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) I do not agree in a great many things. As a matter of fact, his ideas and mine in some matters are as far apart as one pole is from the other.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Oh, I did not think it was as bad as that.

Mr. BROOKS: I am sure he is not going to worry very much over that. But with regard to his administration of the defence of Canada regulations, if he can preserve this country from the dangers of subversive elements, if he can see that Canada does not suffer in war time from the activities of these people, so far as I am concerned I am prepared to assist and support him in every way I can.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I should like to oblige my hon. friend, but really this resolution to appoint a committee has been before the house for two days and we were hoping to have it carried to-day so that the committee might be appointed. Of course, if my hon. friend insists and the house wishes to accommodate her, I personally have no objection.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) has been referred to several times during the debate this evening and she has not really had an opportunity to prepare an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member continues, he will be making a speech and will be out of order. The motion before the house is that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe (Quebec East) the house adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Tuesday, March 4, 1941.

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. HARRIS

ORDER FOR RETURN SHOWING PURCHASES OF LAND IN PICKERING TOWNSHIP

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): I rise to a question of privilege. On February 24 last an order was passed for a return answering the following questions:

1. Has the government bought land in Pickering township, Ontario county, during the last two years?
2. If so, how many acres?
3. For what purpose is the land to be used?

The return has been duly filed, but it is incomplete. To use a common expression, it sidesteps the question entirely, in that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) brought down a long tabulated report of expenditures being made in Pickering township. Through his department lands have been bought or expropriated, at any rate they have been entered upon; fences have been taken down, and at present there is work going on on these particular lands in that county on account of the department.

Mr. HOWE: What does the return say?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): The return says nothing—that is my complaint, and that is why I am raising the question of privilege. Surely an hon. member is entitled to have a proper return rather than a nebulous one of this kind. The return goes on to say that the Department of Justice has not bought any land, the Secretary of State has not bought any land, and so on and so on.

I make one further observation. Immediately that question is put on the order paper, before the printer's ink is dry, the minister's department knows all about it; they are just like watchdogs, knowing everything that happens—and quite rightly so; but to my mind there is an utter lack of frankness in imparting information to hon. members of this house when it is asked for in a straightforward way.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I am perhaps responsible for the return; it may be a return from the