

Inquiries of the Ministry

and I have given the circumstances of that operation on the part of those two. There were a number of other people who were assisting but who were not acting, either with the knowledge of the Canadian security authorities or without their knowledge, with the foreign security agents at all but were assisting in other ways.

Mr. Douglas: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Were the "others" to whom the Prime Minister referred who co-operated with the police civil servants? Were they employed by the Government of Canada?

Mr. Pearson: I am not in a position to answer that question. I do not want to hold anything back that I can appropriately give to the House, but I should like to make inquiries as to the nature of the operations of the others in detail before I would feel it was my duty to give such information to the House. Perhaps in this kind of situation it might even be desirable as this investigation goes on to have some confidential discussions with the leaders of the parties.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a further supplementary question. With reference to the civil servant who did not co-operate with the R.C.M.P. and who was confronted with this matter only last week, may I ask first of all if any steps have been taken to remove him from his position with the Government and, second, who will make the determination whether prosecution will follow?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I answered the latter part of the question by saying that the Government would do so on the advice of the Minister of Justice. So far as the first part of the question is concerned, the civil servant in question, I emphasize again, was not in a job or in a department where he himself had access to any security information. He is now on sick leave, and he is very ill indeed.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister, and I want it understood in the best sense of the words I use. What was the point in the Prime Minister's statement in classifying one person as a naturalized Canadian? Does this language not lend itself to a form of innuendo with regard to other naturalized Canadians? Why not just say "a citizen"?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there was certainly no intention of that kind. As I understand it, the reason that language was used—

[Mr. Pearson.]

and indeed it is related to the purpose of the communiqué itself—was to give publicity to the fact that naturalized Canadians who have perhaps been Canadians for only a few years and who have come from European countries, in some cases from countries behind the Iron Curtain and who have relatives behind the Iron Curtain now, are particularly vulnerable to this kind of pressure.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he is now in a position to answer the question I asked yesterday with regard to what industrial fields this espionage was particularly directed at, and especially what phases of the gas and oil industry seemed to be of interest in view of the fact that the original statement said that a pipe line was one of the matters about which information was being secured.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to the details of the communiqué in this regard, but I can say again what I said in my statement, that notwithstanding the length of time these operations continued no information of any security value was transmitted.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I ask this question because there still seems to be some confusion. Were there more than two or only two Canadian civil servants connected with these negotiations with foreign agents? The Prime Minister spoke of one who co-operated and one who did not. Were there only two?

Mr. Pearson: There was only one.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): In explaining the activities of the people referred to, the Prime Minister referred to the fact that they assisted. Why then was it necessary, in the last line of his statement on page 1088 of *Hansard*, to state:

—no action is at this time being taken against them.

Are we to assume from that statement that action will be undertaken at a later date?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, not in respect of any single person, with the possible exception of the man I have mentioned.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mine is a related question and normally should be asked of the Minister of Industry. However, in view of continuing reports of subversive activities, and particularly of the two spies