

Interim Supply

made a prepared statement today. I want it clear once and for all that the statements made on these two days had no basis in fact in order to assure that Mr. Norman's memory will not be subjected to the stigma of statements such as were made there.

I want to say something more. The other day the minister made a very lengthy and resonant speech on the use of security information furnished by Canada to corresponding institutions in the United States, and with great resolution he said that we have warned the United States that from now on none of our security information will be available to the United States in any way, in order to deny the use of this confidential information to any investigating committee of congress. I now ask him this question. Having regard to the items in today's *Montreal Gazette* and *Toronto Globe and Mail* dealing with this matter, did any of the information that was placed upon the records of this subcommittee in the United States originate in any way, directly or indirectly, in communications from Canada in connection with security regulations?

It is a proper question, because if it did not, and the press reports today indicate that it did not, then all of the courageous stand taken by the minister the other day is meaningless. Why should the United States be denied that spirit of co-operation that has prevailed in the past unless some of the information furnished by Canada did in fact find its way in an improper manner into the possession of this committee? I ask the minister specifically, without going into details, and I honour the confidentiality of those communications: Did any portion of the information transmitted by Canadian security bodies find improper use in the records of the United States senate committee?

It is a very simple question. If the minister says it did not, then all of his statements the other day about the tremendously courageous action of saying to the United States that from now on we will not furnish any security information are meaningless. If they did use it, then everything he said was justified. On the basis of an article appearing in the *Gazette* from the *New York Times* service and also appearing in the *New York Times* itself, I ask the minister whether once and for all he will clear this matter. Did the United States authorities improperly, unjustly or in a manner not in keeping with confidentiality, disclose anything that was ever communicated to them with reference to Mr. Norman?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer the question; indeed, I think I answered it in the House of Commons in my

statement. It is too bad that the hon. gentleman did not read it again. I said at that time that we had no complaint in this matter about the way in which information sent by our security agency in Canada to the security agency in the United States was used. I can also confirm that on this occasion and in regard to this matter the information obtained by the subcommittee was not, to the best of our knowledge, obtained from any Canadian security source via a United States agency. They did not, so far as we know, act on any Canadian official information. They got their information about a Canadian diplomat from their own sources. My hon. friend knows that this kind of United States committee can subpoena anybody.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then why penalize their department for something they did not do?

Mr. Pearson: My hon. friend complains that we did not do anything, and when we try to do something he complains that what we are doing is not going to be of any use.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why penalize them for something they did not do?

Mr. Pearson: It might be helpful if he would give us some constructive advice as to what he would do. As I also said in my statement the other day, the situation that developed two or three weeks ago in regard to this disclosure of information caused us to examine once again whether we should in these circumstances send any security information from Canada even to the United States security agency unless we can get the assurance from that agency that such information will not go to a congressional subcommittee or any congressional committee.

We knew the difficulties of the constitution of the United States, and if they could not give us that assurance because of those constitutional difficulties then I said that we would reserve our right to cut off security information from all United States agencies. My hon. friend is complaining about that because it might hurt the United States and interfere with our confidential and friendly relations. Here is something that is within our power. If a congressional or any other committee of the United States legislature acts in an irresponsible way by making public information concerning a Canadian citizen, particularly a Canadian official, wherever it gets its information about that Canadian, instead of sending it to Canadian sources for checking; if they do that in a United States congressional sub-committee then we reserve the right to say that we cannot take a chance of any such committee

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]