

condemned by some of the members of the parliamentary committee was this setting up of a review committee of one man. We were told with some degree of justice that no one-man committee, even though the member held a high judicial position in the past, or was a justice at the moment, could properly investigate and render judgment in connection with men who were interned under these regulations. Yet we are told to-day that the Minister of Justice, a member of the government of Canada, should divest himself of responsibility and give it to this one-man committee, which was perhaps the most severely condemned of all the defence of Canada regulations.

I noticed the other day when the Minister of Justice followed the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, he complimented that hon. member upon the fact that at no time had he put forth the thought: Why should we fight for democracy abroad when we are losing democracy at home? The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart made no such reference. I have here, however, a Vancouver paper dated January 6 in which is to be found an article by a member of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, a member of the legislature of British Columbia. I may say this is not the same member referred to the other day by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). Perhaps I may be permitted to digress for a moment and say that this legislator would not make the type of speech exposed in this house the other day by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Who is he?

Mr. TURGEON: Mrs. Jamieson. In commenting upon the defence of Canada regulations, she completed her argument with these words:

Why does the Canadian government not follow suit? Because it fears that by its own policies it has lost the loyalty of these men; and so they are lost to Canadian industry and the Canadian war effort. And as the public sees more arbitrary internments, more convictions on flimsy charges, and intimidations of labour unions, men ask themselves: "What is the use of fighting for democracy abroad, when we are losing it every day at home?" This attitude, induced by Canadian war regulations, loses the war abroad, and is dangerous both to democracies and to Canada.

She was referring to what had taken place in Great Britain, and I shall have a word or two to say about that in answering the hon. member for Weyburn. The hon. member made reference to the communist party and he got into somewhat of an altercation with the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette). The other day the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart made a similar reference

[Mr. Turgeon.]

to the communist party, but he said that he held the communist party in contempt. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I believe him when he says that he holds them in contempt, but I am dealing with an argument and as it was applied to public opinion in this country. He gave as his reason for holding them in contempt the fact that in spite of the attitude which the communist party had taken with regard to the war against Germany prior to the actual outbreak of the war, after Great Britain was at war, instead of participating in the effort of the people of the British isles and the British commonwealth, the communist party stated that this was a war of imperialism abroad brought about by capitalism.

Unfortunately, we have heard those very words in Canada. Unfortunately, we have heard them in British Columbia, and in spite of the fact that my hon. friends across the aisle say that no political party is a greater target for the communists than they, it was prominent members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party who made statements with regard to this being an imperialistic war and one brought about naturally by acts of capitalism for many years before the war started. I mention that not for purposes of recrimination, but because I notice that every time some people in Canada make an attack on the defence of Canada regulations, they immediately start to dissociate themselves from the communists and to say that the whole object which the Minister of Justice and those associated with him have in the administration of these regulations is the coercion of labour, and they immediately say, as the hon. member for Weyburn said to-night, that they are a target for the communist party.

May I digress to suggest first of all that if my hon. friends over there are at outs with the communist party, if the communist party is taking pot-shots at them, it is, I feel certain, only the natural instinctive reaction of one group that is angry at another group whose objectives are the same as its own but who are taking a different path to reach those objectives; and that animosity exhibited by the communist party towards my hon. friends over there is in complete alignment with the animosity expressed by my hon. friends themselves towards the Unity reform party composed of the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen). The hon. member for Weyburn to-night and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart the other day stated that the *Canadian Tribune*, on whose behalf both these hon. members raised a word of protest in this house, had attacked the Cooperative