

Supply—Justice

immigration about the very kind of thing the hon. member is talking about. I think the public might be very much reassured if we were told not how the police made an evaluation as such, but how they assess the information; because some of the information is of such of trivial character that it would not be passed on. What trained and competent people do this?

Mr. Fulton: My hon. friend, I am sure, did not try to suggest that my answer had suggested that the constable reports directly to the agency asking for information. These reports are, of course, sent in to the directorate of the security and intelligence agency of the force. As my hon. friend said, there may be a number of reports from different sources. These are evaluated in the security and intelligence agency. Perhaps what my hon. friend is asking me is what is the process by which they are evaluated as to the importance to be attached to them. There are, of course, different degrees of importance. If that is the question I think I can answer it in this way.

Mr. Pickersgill: I did not want to be unfair to the minister in any way. I think I know the answer myself.

Mr. Fulton: They are evaluated—

An hon. Member: Why ask the question, then?

Mr. Pickersgill: Because I think the public would like to know.

Mr. Fulton: If I may be permitted to answer, they are evaluated with respect to the reliability of the source of information. That is perhaps a feature that I should have realized would be of interest to the hon. member for Port Arthur in asking the question, because the department asking for the information will, of course, have the responsibility for making its decision, of assessing the weight to be attached to the information, and they are advised by the force as to the reliability of the source of information from which this record is compiled, or the various sources from which the record is compiled.

In the light of this discussion I should say, however, something with reference to a remark made earlier by the hon. member who started the discussion, and that is that we have absolutely no information to indicate that we would be justified in relaxing the security precautions that we took with regard to subversive activities in this country, no information whatsoever that would justify us in relaxing those at all.

Mr. Fisher: Does the minister mean by this that the threat is as dangerous in terms of numbers and potential as it has been ever since 1946?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be drawn into a discussion of degrees of danger. I will say this, that the efforts being made now are as great as they were in 1946, and I have already said we have no information or indication that would justify us in relaxing those efforts.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, let me return to one example that I used. There are approximately 20,000 people of Finnish stock at the lakehead. They are referred to as red Finns and white Finns. This is a cleavage that tends to split the community. I might say, to be fair, that the majority of this particular group have proved their loyalty, their allegiance and everything else. In the main I feel you can apply this to almost the whole group. If you want to analyse the Labour Progressive party vote you will find there has been a diminution that is exceptional.

When I brought up the matter of this woman who was turned down for citizenship I got all this publicity from the *Toronto Star*, and one of my acquaintances in the police force, who works in close association with the R.C.M.P., flatly said to me, "You want to get out of that. The Finnish organization of Canada is a communist organization; it is on the list of the bad ones". Why could we not know what organizations or groups there are in Canada that the R.C.M.P. consider subversive or dangerous? Is it a question of trying to protect the innocent people who may unsuspectingly get into such organizations? Should we not as the general public have the opportunity to judge the validity of the decisions made by the R.C.M.P. as to what organizations are subversive? Is it not possible that organizations can change and alter in their attitudes and in their personalities, and so alter the relative nature of their subversiveness?

Whenever we have a discussion of this kind from this new broom that was going to sweep clean and check up the bureaucracy all we get is the same type of stone wall. I do not see why there cannot be more frankness in this particular area and why we cannot know more of the standards that are applied in determining security risks and subversiveness. The situation in the last couple of years has given us so few indications of real risk that I think it is about time we looked at this again.

I like to feel that I am in the liberal tradition and always have suspicion of any police activities which are protected from the