

*Defence of Canada Regulations*

the minister received from this association a list of names of persons who should immediately be placed in internment camps, because of the danger of obstructing directly or indirectly Canada's war effort?

In all of these cases, however, the police are not able to adduce evidence to bring them into court, either because they have committed no overt act or because witnesses cannot be induced to appear in court to give evidence to convict them. If the Minister of Justice would exercise the power vested in him under regulation 21, the procedure would be very simple and about as follows: Upon receipt of representations that any person should be interned—which representations might be made by any chief of police, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Ontario provincial police or the attorney general—he would refer the matter to an organization within his department, headed perhaps by the deputy minister of justice and including other legal and police officials. That organization would sift the evidence and recommend to the Minister of Justice what should be done. He would then either act on the recommendation or ask for further evidence as he might see fit. It must be remembered that anybody interned by the Minister of Justice has the right to appeal to a tribunal which it is the minister's duty to set up. This tribunal under the regulations is presided over by a judge of a superior court. It will be clear, therefore, that no great hardship would be done if a person were improperly interned; no doubt the tribunal would straighten it out in short order. It is conceivable that if the minister exercises his powers under regulation 21 some few persons might be improperly interned. It becomes a question, therefore, as to whether the inconvenience of these few persons should weigh against the safety or perhaps the survival of the state.

I have been in contact with police authorities and find them seriously alarmed about the freedom allowed to enemy aliens and the subversive elements in this country. They cannot understand the complacency with which this dangerous situation is being met. Internment is not a fitting punishment for some of these people. Should not the Minister of Justice profit by the example of Great Britain and France and take capital power, and when necessary enforce it? I am not arguing for this method of dealing with crime in peace time, but it is essential in time of war. If Canadian lives are lost as a consequence of not using the power given under regulation 21, a heavy responsibility will rest on the shoulders of the Minister of Justice.

[Mr. Bruce.]

In order not to delay the house I will hand in a list of organizations and publications which have not yet been outlawed by the government, but which should be banned forthwith. All these have been actively associated with the spreading of subversion. Some may be inactive at the present time, but there is a danger that they may again become active in order to take the place of organizations which have been outlawed. With the consent of the house may I place the list on *Hansard* without reading it?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BRUCE: Shall I read it?

Mr. ROWE: Read it, then.

An hon. MEMBER: Read it all.

Mr. DUPUIS: You are getting plenty of practice; read it.

Mr. BRUCE: I shall now read into the record the names of organizations and publications which as yet have not been outlawed or banned by the government. All have been actively associated with the spreading of subversion. Some may be inactive at the present time, but there is a danger that they may again become active, in order to take the place of organizations which have been outlawed.

Mr. RALSTON: Is my hon. friend making the statement, himself, that all these organizations have been guilty of subversion, or is it made on information received? On what is so wide and general a statement made?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think the hon. member should be cross-examined.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not cross-examining, but I want to know whether the hon. member makes the statement himself, or whether it is made on information received.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He has made the statement.

Mr. ROWE: The government has been asking for it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Read the list.

Mr. BRUCE: The list of organizations is—

Mr. RALSTON: Does the hon. member object to my interruption?

Mr. BRUCE: No.

Mr. RALSTON: I have asked whether the statement that these different organizations are all guilty of subversion is made on my hon. friend's personal knowledge, or on information which he has received?