

*Communist Activities in Canada*

in business. It was during the depression days and jewelry was not selling very well. I said: "I see you have some watches in the window." He said: "Yes, I have some." He said: "This is a very good watch; it is a \$16 watch. I will give it to you for \$8." I thought, well, I don't know—I bought the watch.

**Mr. Fournier (Maisonnette-Rosemont):** For how much?

**Mr. Hansell:** For \$8.

**Mr. Knowles:** Where did the money come from?

**Mr. Hansell:** Mr. Speaker, I say this is a very homely illustration. I went back to that man on a number of occasions and bought things from him. I talked with him as a friend talks with a friend. He and I never had any difficulty. Of course if my watch had gone on the blink about a week afterwards we might have, but he appeared to be honest. What I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that I am wearing that watch here tonight; I have never had it in a repair shop and it does not lose a minute in a week. He and I did not have any difficulty. As a matter of fact a few years ago I came back and I said to myself: "You know, Hansell, I think you took advantage of that chap." I was going in there to tell him about the watch and pay him another \$8 anyway.

**Mr. Knight:** Did you ever do it?

**Mr. Hansell:** Why bring that up?

**Mr. Knowles:** Send him a copy of *Hansard*.

**Mr. Hansell:** I was just about to do it, Mr. Speaker, when I walked by his place and found that he had sold out to another man. That saved the day.

If these various ethnic groups mind their own business they can get along with each other. I get along perfectly well with them all. Of course if they began to push me around it would be a different story; and I am quite satisfied that if I commenced pushing them around it might be a different story; but so long as we do not push one another around I do not know that we need any particularly stringent laws to try to force people to like one another. That is my view of these things.

I now come to something which I regard as more important than anything else. Suppose this legislation passes. Suppose the government should write into our Criminal Code something that would make the activities of communism, and, as it says here, similar activities, a criminal offence. How can we be sure even then that we are really getting the culprits? I may have some peculiar views

on these matters. Tim Buck was mentioned this afternoon. I do not know whether Tim Buck is the most dangerous man.

**Mr. Sinnott:** Oh yes, he is.

**Mr. Hansell:** He is the head of the communist organization, but when you mention Tim Buck to a person he can label him right away. He says, "Oh, well, we know all about him." They have him categorized. They have him where they want him. They know what you are talking about. I am wondering whether it is the Tim Bucks that you really want to get after. Remember, Mr. Speaker, there is more than one way of selling out a country; there is more than one way of sabotaging a democracy.

I should like to pose this question to anyone who cares to answer it. How deep a hue must pink become before it becomes red?

**Mr. Harkness:** That is a dyer's question.

**Mr. Hansell:** I heard no answer. How deep a hue must pink become before it becomes a danger in Canada? Can we assume, Mr. Speaker, that it is criminal to gain power by a process of rape, while at the same time assume that it is within the law to gain the same end by a process of seduction? These are a few questions that we have reason to think about. The strange thing is that there has been a mentality built up in this country that will condition the people for the acceptance of a mild form of communism. I should like to ask this question to provoke some thought. Did this ever occur to us? How is it that some of those people in responsible positions, who perhaps fell into disrepute because their actions indicated a reddish hue, have resigned their posts only to find that they are welcomed into a wider and more influential field, sometimes going to some branches of the United Nations where criticism has no effect, and where we could not get our hands on them if we wanted to? That has happened over and over again.

The hon. member for Vancouver East gave a rather good speech. I agreed with a good deal of it, but sometimes he likes to tap me on the head, and I like to turn around and tap him. One thing he had to say—and I think it was quite reasonable—was that the best way to extend freedom is to extend it. You know, I cannot quite reconcile that with the fact that every time we want to loosen up controls and give more freedom, he wants to keep them on. It seems a strange sort of thing to me. What he should have said was that the best way to extend freedom is to institute control. I am just pitting what he said there against his philosophy.