

Surely this is the antithesis of British and Canadian democracy. Even the special committee of which I was a member last session was denied access to any files or other documents relating to internments, although the reference gives us some rights in regard to the production of papers.

Now what does all this mean? It means that the police detain and intern a British subject on grounds which seem satisfactory to them. A judge examines this evidence, which the accused has no opportunity of rebutting, and recommends his release. The minister, acting on the advice of his department, including the police who originally made the investigation and laid the charge, refuses to release the person in spite of the judge's recommendation. This is surely a most dangerous situation. The department and the police accuse and detain. The committee, a judge, reviews and recommends release. But the final decision rests with the accuser. This, I submit, is a reversal of all democratic procedure which ought not to be allowed to continue.

The report of the Minister of Justice to which I have referred, presented to the house a week ago, itemizes the detentions since November 1 under the headings Germans, Italians, Communists and National Unity party. I wonder how the released are itemized, and particularly how the nine who were not released were catalogued.

Last week I had occasion to draw the attention of the minister to an article by Commissioner S. T. Wood of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in *The Canadian Spokesman*. On February 19 the minister stated that the article clearly represented conditions as they exist in Canada according to the records of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The gist of the article to which I refer is contained in this paragraph:

Many may be surprised to hear that it is not the nazi nor the fascist but the radical who constitutes our most troublesome problem. Whereas the enemy alien is usually recognizable and easily rendered innocuous by clear-cut laws applicable to his case, your "red" has the protection of citizenship, his foreign master is not officially an enemy and, unless he blunders into the open and provides proof of his guilt, he is much more difficult to suppress. Since communism was outlawed, most of his work is carried on under cover of other organizations and associations pretending to be, or in reality loyal to the constitution.

Make no mistake about this: I have nothing but the utmost contempt for communist activities in relation to the war. Make no mistake about it. Nor, I suppose, is there any group in the house which is more frequently denounced and consistently undermined by the communist party and their fellow travellers than the group to which I belong.

But let me add this, that no matter what the opinion of an individual may be, under our British democratic rights of citizenship, every one of our citizens ought to be entitled to plead his cause and to have a fair and impartial trial.

I said a moment ago that I had nothing but contempt for the communist party. For after years of propaganda, demanding that the democratic nations stand firmly against Hitler and fascism, they first supported the declaration of war in September, 1939, and then, a few weeks later, because it suited Russian foreign policy, they denounced as an imperialist adventure the war which they had urged. Nevertheless, to say that communist activities are more dangerous to democratic institutions than those of fascist and nazi sympathizers is surely to fly in the face of recent history. It was this attitude of mind that allowed the war to steal upon us. It was this attitude of mind which brought about the arrest of the communist leaders in France but let the fascist sympathizers obtain power and then betray her. The views expressed by Commissioner Wood in that regard are the views which destroyed collective security, encouraged the rise of Hitler, and, through the long period of appeasement, brought us to the present crisis in our history.

Let us remember that the present struggle is not between nations as such, or imperialisms as such, but between two conflicting ways of life. As J. B. Priestley has said, we are fighting not only nazism in Germany but the same set of ideas when they are held by people who speak the English tongue and are of British stock. The statement of Commissioner Wood, approved by the department, shows an entire failure to grasp the implications of the present war and the situation generally. Commissioner Wood says, "the radical is the problem." How does he define that term?

Last session the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) complained that copies of her speeches, entitled "Why I Oppose the Budget," had been seized. I was not clear whether they had been seized as such, or among communist or other subversive literature. I therefore made some inquiry and found that at Regina they were the only pamphlets seized. No other pamphlets were taken from the hall. The officer gave his receipt, dated October 3, 1940. I have a copy of it. It reads:

Received from W. Browne, secretary workers protective organization, quantity of papers headed "Why I opposed the budget", accepted for purposes of inquiry.

Woodward, R.C.M.P.