

*Defence of Canada Regulations*

fact that it finds fault with people who hold views different from the views expressed therein, is not sufficient to warrant its being banned in Canada or to warrant the people who publish it being subject to a fine or imprisonment.

We are following a serious tack when we allow this sort of thing to go on. We are going to make martyrs out of certain groups of people. There are people who want nothing so much as to be made martyrs. What is being done is to drive them underground, give some of them the halo of martyrdom and permit many of them to protest that they are suffering for their faith and are being persecuted by those who belong to other religious organizations and other churches in Canada. I urge upon the committee and upon the minister that if they are going to examine the question of illegal organizations, we ought to have a more satisfactory and more comprehensive statement as to why this organization has been banned than we have had up to now.

It has almost become platitudinous to refer to President Roosevelt's four freedoms. We keep on telling the people in the democratic countries that we are fighting for the four freedoms, one of which is the freedom to worship God in the manner in which we choose. It seems to me that it is going to be increasingly difficult to convince the world that we are seeking to get religious freedom for the people of Europe when we deny it to the people of Canada. This itself, in its own way, is an encroachment upon religious freedom. Whether we agree or disagree—I imagine that the great majority of us disagree—with the points of view expressed by that religious sect, I think we do ourselves an injustice and our cause an injustice by continuing to declare them an illegal organization when there is no specific evidence to prove that their efforts and their beliefs are subversive of Canada's war effort.

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the subject under discussion has been considered most thoroughly, but because of the reference made by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) to one or two matters, I feel that as a member of this committee I should say something at this time. I fully support the plea made by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) that consideration should be given to the naturalization laws of Canada and the method by which new citizens are admitted to Canadian nationality. There is great need to consider this matter, either through the agency of this particular committee or through a special committee which

[Mr. T. C. Douglas.]

may be set up. The naturalization laws of Canada are in a most deplorable state. I refer not only to the methods by which citizens are naturalized, but to the laws themselves. They present a most ridiculous situation.

We have a situation where people in our country are, to use a technical phrase, "heimathlos"—"without a home"—who have no nationality at all or who have a nationality in one part of the commonwealth, and although residing in Canada have no nationality whatsoever according to the laws of Canada. This situation should be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

There is another matter I should like to impress upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent). In this connection he has given indications of dispatch. I agree with what the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) has said, that when a nation is at war one cannot stop to question at the outset whether or not a particular person should be interned on the basis of suspicion, or on the basis of a very slight rumour, or upon the slightest evidence for that matter. But one thing cannot be justified, and it is one thing for which there is occasion for criticism. When a man is interned, whether it be upon complaints or upon slight evidence, there can be no justification for keeping him interned month after month without a hearing. Even since the advent of the present Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), and with the setting up of additional committees, there are cases still where the dispatch does not satisfy me. One instance I know of is where a man had been interned. He was readily given his freedom after some urgency was indicated, when it was pointed out that his wife was dying. As a matter of fact, the man was let out the day after his wife died, and no evidence at all had been found against him. In that case the reason for the delay was that the reporter had been assigned to another job outside the government service and had not transcribed the evidence. Because of the dilatoriness of that particular reporter, a man who had been in this country for forty-two years, a man who could not read or write, remained interned—a man who had been found to be innocent. That cannot be justified, and for the reason that I am going to mention.

The house may recall that several months ago I put on the order paper a question concerning one Otto Strasser. The Prime Minister in replying to that question suggested that I might in view of the circumstances seek an interview with the under-secretary of state for external affairs, Mr. Norman Robertson, and examine the file in connection with this man. I have seen the file, and I think any hon. member who has had that opportunity, which