

*Communist Activities in Canada*

democracy? What do we mean by freedom? And why do we fight for them? It's time we got down to examining our own motives . . .

The basic, the terrible and perhaps the fatal thing that has happened to our civilization can now be grasped and understood. . . It is that our western civilization is losing, if it has not already lost, its faith in its beginnings.

We are not going to admit that, but here is a serious man saying it; and it cannot be lightly regarded. I go on to read again. He gives what I think is a perfectly wise definition of the difference between our civilization and the Russian one. He refers to—

. . . the original assumption, common to Christianity and other religions, that the universe is managed by a system of invisible order, and that every man is protected by certain natural laws beyond the reach of human legislatures.

Then later on he says that the Russians reject this wholly, and he goes on to make what I think again is a searching statement:

Since there is no universal power,—

This is the Russian view.

—nothing is left but the power which some men can exert over others.

There I think you have it stated clearly. That is their faith: power, naked power and nothing else. Then he goes on to say:

It is this cardinal lie, this father of all lies, which spawns the Russian system and the Hitler system and every system of tyranny. It is this lie we are now accepting in the western world under the name of science or progress, or political panacea, or economic enlightenment or ultimate truth, or anything else you care to call it.

Then finally he says:

If this goes on we shall be trying to oppose the resurgence of a powerful pagan idea, which has destroyed many civilizations in the past, without any contrary idea of our own in a struggle which ideas, and not other weapons, will finally settle.

Some may feel that these are strange arguments to be using in a secular assembly on the matter of communism; but I make no apology for doing it because it seems to me that these are matters in which we have all got to interest ourselves, not merely the churches and not merely the educational institutions, although the responsibility is primarily theirs, and although I suppose we must look to them chiefly for leadership. But we must not forget our own part because there is the final challenge that we have all got to face.

I have been talking about matters which go far beyond any amendment or indeed far beyond any law. Yet the law cannot be disregarded because it enters into all areas and all departments of human conflict. It is for that reason that I shall support this amendment which, as I have said more than once, is not suggesting any witch-hunting or any psychoanalysis. It is merely suggesting that the department shall use its best endeavours

[Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood).]

to see whether the law can be still further improved to the end that, as to the efforts of all agencies—labour, business and every other agency—that are seeking to deal with this matter which threatens the very vitals of our existence, these efforts may be further assisted.

**Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart):** Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I was not here during the whole of the address of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) yesterday; I entered the house just before he moved the amendment under discussion. I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell) for whom I have a great respect, particularly because I have known in days gone by how forthrightly he has stood for civil liberty. I quite sympathize with him when he says that he belonged to a civil liberties association some few years ago into which the communist or Labour-Progressive party infiltrated, and described how these people remained until the dying moments of a meeting in order to get their kind of resolution through after the more democratic people had got tired and had gone home to bed, which is the usual practice of communists and others of like mind. He criticized the C.C.F. because, he says, on the address on February 20 we amended the amendment to a motion that was then before the house by adding words to it. Let me point out that the amendment when amended dealt with "harmful activities of communists and fascists in Canada". It was not the same, nor had it the same intent, as the amendment moved yesterday by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew). If we examine the language of yesterday we find that it reads as follows:

Legislation should be introduced so that communist and similar activities in Canada may be made an offence punishable under the Criminal Code.

These activities were interpreted this afternoon by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell) as overt acts, if I may use the term that he himself used. Let me point out to him that in all democratic countries, at least within the British commonwealth of nations, there is on the statute books today legislation adequate, I am sure the Minister of Justice would say, to deal with overt acts of sedition or conspiracy to commit overt acts. Consequently, as far as that goes, the two amendments were different in their conception. Perhaps I might go further and say that, in my opinion, the policy of the government under discussion at that time involved also failure to do certain things, we will say, for the unemployed, to improve our social security legislation and so on. But I am not going into that phase of it this afternoon.