

circumstances were fully set out in the local paper and I do not think the matter was unfairly stated. That was a couple of weeks ago, and he was attacked for his remarks and given an opportunity to correct them if he had been misquoted. I know that newspapers by headlines can misrepresent a man's intention, but in this case I think it is accurate. The headline reads:

Cameron opposed to war savings campaign.

The article goes on to say:

Mr. Cameron opened his address with a bitter attack upon the campaign through which the government urged the people to invest in war savings stamps and certificates, declaring that all those who condone and assist the campaign are "helping to put shackles on the people of Canada."

Further on he said:

All war necessities must be produced at cost plus wear and tear, and the entire cost must be paid out of taxation. "It won't be, however," he stated, "as long as the people allow themselves to be bamboozled by such polite blackmailing schemes as the war savings campaign."

Fairly strong! There was a large advertising scheme going on at the time to further the sale of war savings certificates. Further on he stated that:

. . . the safety of Canada depended upon dispossessing the owning classes, and that the C.C.F. party stood ready to propose a bold, almost revolutionary, programme.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is that?

Mr. NEILL: One of the leading Cooperative Commonwealth Federation men in British Columbia, a member of the local house. I think he might have left out the word "almost." Then he goes on to say:

My quarrel is against allowing our young men to risk their lives while we still leave a percentage in a privileged position to profit by the grief and woe of the rest and for that reason I cannot believe in the sincerity of those who say we are fighting this war for democracy.

The people of Canada are being misled and betrayed by such schemes as this war savings campaign and I see my duty as a public representative to protest.

I think a case like that having been presented to the minister, did require some attention. Remember, this is not a man of no importance; he occupies the position of a member of the local house and his words get the publicity and attention to which they are entitled. The paper printed an editorial objecting strongly to this and a couple of weeks went by; the gentleman had every opportunity to correct or modify his statements, and he has not done so.

This gentleman spent a great deal of his time touring the province—as he has a right

to do as provincial organizer—promulgating his views. They are naturally very strongly Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, which in itself is not objectionable, but they are also strongly tinged with diluted communism; it is often hard to tell the difference between one and the other. We from British Columbia—the situation may be different on the prairies—know how close the relationship is between those two phases of thought, shall we call them?

The other day I received some adverse comment because I referred to the fact that the recent dominion election in British Columbia resulted in the return of only one Cooperative Commonwealth Federation member instead of, I think, four that were in the last parliament. They got one man in out of sixteen candidates. Perhaps the house will understand the reason better when I throw this further light on the views expressed by this prominent leader of that body:

The picture is like this—pro-Jap yesterday; anti-Canada to-day; pro-nazi to-morrow!

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Before the motion is carried I should like to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a question about the text of the reference. It is about the same as last year. The minister has done very excellent work—both ministers; it has meant a lot of very heavy work for them. But would it not be better to extend the term of this committee for two or three years so they may lay out a long-range policy? They could meet in the recess, and if fees are necessary they should be paid.

I have here a copy of the report of the proceedings of the Dies committee to the United States house of representatives, adopted last month. They made one recommendation which I think is important and should be incorporated in the terms of reference. As I see it the reference is not broad enough to cover two things: (a) subversive matters in Canada; (b) anti-Canadian propaganda, in regard to which the Secretary of State and the minister have done good work. I should like to see this committee given wider powers. Last year there was a very able chairman, a university man, the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght).

I call attention to one clause in the Dies report of January, 1941, adopted by congress. They recommended that the government—

(4) withhold all federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism or nazism as a substitute for our form of government to the student body of these educational institutions.

There was only one dissenting voice in that committee. One member objected that it