

his colleagues, however, that they have just been found guilty by public opinion of having been up to now far too complacent about their war plans. The scope of their effort, in the light of present emergencies, has been inadequate. They are therefore hardly in a position to announce that they are right, and the public wrong, about the formation of this additional auxiliary force. The public quite properly can reply: "You were wrong in the other matter. How do we know you are right about this?"

The editorial then goes on to point out the necessity of the government authorizing the formation of such corps. The acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Power) said to-day that it was impossible to allow these corps to be organized outside government supervision. He stated that in any event it would not be possible to supply them with arms and ammunition. To-day in Saskatchewan General Ross is organizing such a corps. Although such an organization is not authorized by the government, the need therefor is felt in Saskatchewan because there is in some sections a strong current of anti-British feeling.

How can we expect not to have anti-British feeling when we permit periodicals to enter Canada which attempt to destroy the morale of our people? Why should such anti-British publications as the *Saturday Evening Post* and the *Chicago Tribune* be allowed to enter the country? What is the use of having a department of information to furnish dependable information to the people if such information is neutralized, if not completely destroyed, by malicious articles appearing in these particular papers? If I understand the defence of Canada regulations, the only provision for prosecution in such a case is that provided by section 15. Under this section prosecution can be carried out only when a newspaper or periodical is published in Canada.

Parliament to-day realizes as never before that we have but one duty—to provide the maximum war effort to win this war. This war is being waged on two fronts—the battle front and the home front. The defence of Canada regulations were designed to ensure the solidarity of the Canadian people and to prevent malicious disaffection from destroying the continuity of our war effort or interfering with the production and transportation of munitions, materials, and food for our armies here and overseas. The safeguarding of our interests overseas as a nation, of our homes, of our right to live, is in the hands of our gallant boys. They will not fail us. The safeguarding of our nation from destructive and subversive influences that would nullify their sacrifices is in the hands of this parliament. We must not fail them.

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate. However, some remarks that have been made during the course of the debate prompt me to rise for just a few moments in order to make one or two observations. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) outlined quite adequately the stand of this group with reference to this motion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I should like to touch upon four points and emphasize them quite briefly. First, we realize that under present circumstances there is a need to give the government extraordinary powers. We are engaged in a war carried on by a new technique. This is not only a war of nations; it is a war of ideologies. The people who believe in these ideologies have no particular mark upon their foreheads. They have carried on a programme of peaceful penetration in many nations of the world. They have undermined the states that they sought to conquer. In order to meet this threat the democracies have had to speed up and alter their method of dealing with it. With that in mind, we realize, as must all people who believe in democracy, the need of giving to the executive extraordinary powers.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) has claimed that there are two points of view in connection with these regulations. The one is that the regulations were too severe; the other, that they were not severe enough. I doubt if that is a fair appraisal of the situation. I think the real position is that there is one group of people who feel that the regulations are not lacking in severity so much as that they have not been enforced with sufficient aggression. I cannot say whether that is well founded, but the fact remains that there is that feeling. It is quite understandable. For instance, in western Canada we have had for a number of years an organization known as the *deutscher bund*. Many of the men who joined this organization did so out of bravado, while others were attracted by the cultural association. Many had no knowledge of the unscrupulous intent of the organization and they left when they became aware of its real purpose. The fact remains that in western Canada this organization was in existence in many German-Canadian communities and has aroused considerable concern. As the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) has suggested, this is quite understandable.

The people are perturbed. They feel, not that these regulations should be made more severe, but that they should be enforced and that proper precautions should be taken. We