

*Communist Activities in Canada*

integrity and fair dealing as between man and man, group and group, nation and nation, to the category of vices. Because it has done that it is hard, if not impossible, for anyone who believes in the virtues that it has turned into vices to have any association with communists under any circumstances, because you just cannot believe at any particular moment that their words mean what the words imply in our language and in our meaning. On that score I think there is very little difference between the members of this house.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question, because it might clarify my own understanding of the situation presented by these words? In the amendment to the speech from the throne, as amended by the party to which the hon. member now speaking belongs, appears the following words:

Failed to take adequate measures to protect civil liberties and at the same time curb espionage and other harmful activities of communists and fascists in Canada.

I would have thought that this was entirely in line with this motion.

**Mr. MacInnis:** I doubt whether it is in line with this motion; but I submit that our sub-amendment had to be based on the wording of the amendment before it, and because of that certain phrases had to be used. In any event, I do not agree that this amendment and the other amendment have the same meaning.

In the session of 1948 a bill was introduced by a private member with phrasing somewhat similar to that proposed in this amendment. In speaking to that bill I made the following remarks, which will be found at page 2926 of *Hansard* of 1948:

May I point out that no country ever saved itself from revolution or from overthrow by oppressive laws. If oppressive laws have any merit, if they would prevent subversive methods from growing, the communist party would never have come into existence, but the fact of the matter is that the communist party grew and prospered where oppression flourished. There is only one way in which freedom can be extended. That is by extending it. We cannot extend freedom by limiting it. We have laws now on our statute books for dealing with sedition and overt acts. Let us apply these laws where and when there is need, but do not let us begin to make laws to ban ideas, because such laws just won't work.

That was my position in 1948; that is my position today. We cannot make laws to ban ideas but we can make laws to deal with overt acts. It has been my opinion for a long time that the danger from communism lies mainly in the lack of the people's understanding of what communism really is and the conditions out of which it grows.

If there had been freedom of thought, freedom of political action in Russia, prior to 1917, as there was, say, in the United Kingdom and in other countries of western Europe, there would have been no communist party in Russia, and no revolution of the kind that took place in Russia in 1917; but because everything that the czarist government did not believe in, and every thought that they felt was a danger to their safety, were suppressed, there developed the conviction that since we cannot change existing conditions by peaceful means, and if we are going to change conditions at all, then we must change them by force.

I have been troubled, as I said, because I find that even today, despite all we have learned since 1917 of what communism means, and all we have learned since the end of the war of social, economic and political development in communist controlled countries, people do not yet understand what communism means. I say, understand how it works, and understand how and why it grows.

Following the Soviet union's share in the war against Hitler, the Soviet union gained millions of friends among the peoples who were in that war on the same side, but they overlooked entirely how the war began, what it was that gave Hitler his opportunity, and they overlooked entirely how the Soviet union came into it. They saw only that the Soviet union put up a wonderful struggle in opposition to nazism. Then, as the various conferences took place from 1944 on, among Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill, I saw in conference after conference the allied leaders giving away concrete concessions of great value to Stalin for, on his side, promises about abstract principles which he never intended to honour, promises he never intended to keep; there was the exchange of territorial concessions for a promise that democratic elections would be held in various countries coming under communist control.

That is the sort of thing that troubles me. While the Chinese civil war was going on I got myself disliked in social gathering after social gathering because I disagreed with people who insisted upon telling me that the Chinese communists were not communists at all, not communist like the Russian communist, but merely simple peasants who were trying to better their conditions.

It is true that the great mass of the Chinese people were not and are not communists; but it is equally true that those who were directing the civil war were and are communists who accept the same philosophy as the communists of the Soviet union. As a matter of fact, so deluded are people who ought to know better that in 1944 the chief justice of British