

Meanwhile, the Canadian Government received the note from the United States Secretary of State transmitting the first request of the Senate subcommittee to interview Mr. Gouzenko, the note of October 29 with which I have already dealt, and the request in this first note was to interview Mr. Gouzenko in Canada.

As the House will recall, because I made a statement at the time in the House, the Canadian Government replied that Mr. Gouzenko had stated to the RCMP that he had been misquoted by the *Chicago Tribune* and had no additional information to give. The United States Government, therefore, was notified that under the circumstances we assumed that the reasons for the request from the Senate subcommittee had disappeared. I think it was a reasonable assumption to make in view of the interview I have just mentioned between Mr. Gouzenko and the RCMP, but it turned out to be otherwise.

On November 21, I think it was, the same newspaper, the *Chicago Tribune*, carried another interview with Mr. Gouzenko in which the latter was purported to have upheld the accuracy of the first interview reported in the newspaper on October 25, and to have again expressed the desire for an interview with the United States officials. This made the situation somewhat confusing, and I should like at this point to reaffirm to the House what I said on November 17 last regarding Mr. Gouzenko's statement to the RCMP. It was, of course, on the basis of this statement that the Canadian Government prepared its reply to the first request transmitted by the State Department. Our reply was delivered on November 4.

This second article to which I have referred in the *Chicago Tribune* cast some doubt on the RCMP report, and indeed had some hard things to say about my own good faith and veracity, which are not important enough to trouble the House with. I would merely say that I accept, myself, the accuracy and reliability of that RCMP report. We have generally found, in this House and in this country, that RCMP reports are both accurate and reliable.

Second Note Received

However, on November 19, the State Department delivered another note, a second note, to our Ambassador in Washington transmitting a second request from the subcommittee, relating to Mr. Gouzenko, which I have already mentioned. Incidentally . . . whereas the original note from the State Department forwarded a request from the subcommittee's counsel to interview Mr. Gouzenko in Canada, the latest note, the second note, forwards a request from the subcommittee chairman this time that Mr. Gouzenko, and I am quoting from it, "be made available for questioning by the subcommittee".

Mr. Gouzenko, as I stated, of course is available in that, like any Canadian, he is free to exercise his own judgment to determine his own movements. He can, of course, as I have said, discuss any subject at any time with anyone whom he chooses, and he is the person to consider the effect of such action on the special measures which have been taken since he came over to us in 1945, in his interests and at his request, to protect him.

Conditions for Interview

The exact purport of the United States note that Mr. Gouzenko be made available for questioning is perhaps not clear, in that it is not explicitly stated where this questioning would take place and under whose responsibility. Presumably, as indeed I have already said, the Canadian Government would be expected to take some responsibility in the matter. While I have said that our security authorities do not believe there is any further information to be obtained, the Government, in view of this second request from a friendly neighbour, is willing to make arrangements for a meeting to be held under Canadian auspices and in conformity with Canadian procedures. If Mr. Gouzenko is willing to attend at such a meeting, and this is in our note which we gave the United States this afternoon, any person designated by the United States Government for this purpose could be present and of course ask questions. It