

Supply—Justice

judged to be a communist front organization, I do not think it is possible to arrive at such definitions. The methods of the communists are so infinitely various or devious or skillful I should think you would have to have a 500-page book before you could define every one of the members they might have and therefore every type of organization that should be deemed to be suspect on security grounds. I just do not think we can get a simple, over-all, standard definition of what is a subversive or security risk and leave it at that.

Mr. Fisher: May I just give an example to the minister. A couple of years ago when I was teaching grades 10 and 11 students an official of the department of education was trying to line up for me and several others just what our duties and responsibilities should be. He said to us, "You have a very serious responsibility. Many of these young people are going to drop out of school just about now, so in your social studies and in your teaching of citizenship and that sort of thing you have to prepare these young people to go out and face the communist menace".

At the time I thought it was a nonsensical bit of advice and I still think so. How are you going to prepare 15 year olds and 16 year olds in social studies to go out and face the communist menace? I do not know. If a teacher is obliged to assume that kind of burden he has a complete cloud or haze in which to work.

This is exactly the kind of analogy or parallel that I think we are facing today in so far as subversiveness is concerned. What is this communist menace, this subversive danger that we face, that requires these directives, that requires you to send constables around the country quizzing neighbours and that sort of thing? We just do not know what it is. We do not know its scope. We just have the assurance of the minister, which I respect very much, that he feels there really has been no change.

I think we could have a little bit more of a definition. The minister says the communists are so varied and so clever in their various approaches. I do not doubt that at all, but where is the public evidence of their cleverness? In a political way they have gone down the drain to quite an extent. They have lost or are losing daily their grip on any organizations where they have been strong in the labour movement. Where is this cleverness, this great worry that you have? It seems to me that the people of Canada in a very reasonable way have met the menace. I think it is about time we knew a little bit more or had a redefinition of what the Royal Canadian Mounted Police

[Mr. Fulton.]

director of security and intelligence feels the menace is at the time and how they go about defining it and fighting it.

Mr. Pearson: I confess that I have some sympathy with the minister's reluctance to attempt the definition of "subversive". He might have exactly the same difficulties as if he were trying to define "freedom", "democracy", "appeasement" or "fascism". No doubt he had similar difficulty when he was attempting to define "obscenity", as I gather he has done although the results may appear to be inadequate to some members of the house.

I think he was right, of course, when he defended the practice of not making public lists of subversive organizations, which is perhaps not quite the same as lists of communists or communist front organizations which are known to be such. That is in contrast, of course, to the practice—and I think it is a good contrast—across the border where they do have their blacklists or lists of subversive organizations, and where I suspect they have lists of Canadian organizations which they consider to be subversive and perhaps a list of members of those organizations.

That leads me to ask the minister a question which I think is an appropriate one. He will know how far he can go in replying to it. The question is this. How are the arrangements working between the appropriate security authorities of the two governments in respect of the exchange of security information? Is the minister satisfied that these arrangements are not being abused? I am not suggesting that the arrangements themselves are not required and are not in certain circumstances quite proper. But are these arrangements being conducted in such a way that they are not being abused to the prejudice of Canadians who, for instance, may want to get into the United States and who find themselves on some United States immigration list as a result of information which the United States immigration authorities have obtained?

Is the minister satisfied that the security information which is sent to the United States authorities is not being used in Washington by agencies of the United States government, executive or legislative, in a way which would be inappropriate? That is the mildest word I can use in that connection. I am asking whether he thinks the arrangements—with which I am not necessarily quarrelling—are working satisfactorily, and by "satisfactorily" I mean in a sense which will not prejudice the rights or freedoms of Canadians.