

distasteful but which have to be done. All one can do is attempt to fulfil his duty and discharge the responsibility that is upon him, no matter how distasteful it may be.

The hon. member for Swift Current has said that there was apparently panic prompted by fear of communism or fear of Russia. There was no such panic and there was no fear of communism or fear of Russia, but there was fear of the apparent development in the public service of Canada of a loyalty to ideals other than Canadian ideals which would have been very detrimental to the national life of this country, and it was to search out that thing and rid the public service of Canada of it that the royal commission was established.

With respect to the quotation that nothing good comes from actions directed merely against something, I beg to differ, because I think much good will come from action directed against the spread of that mentality in the public service of our country.

Third, with reference to the recommendation of the hon. member that we consider exonerating those who have not been charged, or charge them, all those against whom there is in the report the suggestion that they have been guilty of conduct which would constitute offences will be charged before the courts and allowed a full opportunity to face the accusation and to disprove it if it is unfounded, unless it is found, by counsel selected by the department, that there are not sufficient grounds for even having a trial, and if that is found by counsel it will be published.

Mr. BENTLEY: Will they be exonerated?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Well, if that does not imply as great exonerations as the report itself implies criticism, I do not know what other conclusion would be drawn from it. If the department, having employed counsel, gets the opinion from counsel that there is not enough to justify a trial, that advice is accepted by the department and its decision upon it made public, that should amount to an exoneration.

With respect to those who have been found guilty, hon. gentlemen may be assured that they are receiving the ordinary treatment that is accorded to all those who are unfortunately subject to detention in the penal institutions of the country. There should not be any impression that there is any animosity against individuals. There is detestation of what was revealed in the trials, but it is not directed against individuals; indeed, there is much sympathy felt for individuals because even the report shows that they were on a

slippery path. I think one of the great advantages of the publicity given to the report has been to awaken the conscience of large multitudes in Canada at the realization that there are slippery paths which it is advisable to avoid.

I may say to the hon. member for Cariboo that at no time was Doctor Shugar a permanent employee. At one time the confidence of the minister responsible to this house for the conduct of the department was shaken, so far as Doctor Shugar was concerned, to the extent that he no longer wished to be responsible to parliament and did not wish to continue that person in his employ, and that is something which all of us have to face up to. I know of an interview between Doctor Shugar and the minister in which the attitude of Doctor Shugar was such that, even if there had been nothing else, his minister would probably not have considered retaining him in his employment. Doctor Shugar was perhaps convinced, because of the depth of his feeling in the matter, that what he was saying was so, but he stated there that the royal commissioners had deliberately falsified the evidence. I would not retain in the service of my department anyone who expressed to me the opinion that two of the justices of the Supreme Court of Canada had deliberately falsified evidence.

Mr. IRVINE: I must accept the minister's statement, but I would not leave the matter there if I had time, because there are other phases of the situation with which I should like to deal. I might say, however, that it could not but be prejudicial to the case of Doctor Shugar to have him discharged. However, we shall have to let that go now. As far as its international implications are concerned—and there are international implications—I would say that the evidence which we have against some of our own citizens, and which has sent some of them to gaol and may send others, was based upon the statements of a man who had been a traitor to his own country and whom we protected, and while protecting him we were endeavouring to punish people who were alleged to have committed similar offences in our own country. That is probably permissible in law, but it is not a very sound basis on which to build a case. I should like to get at some of the things that were quoted and were reported in the royal commission's report coming from the lips of Gouzenko, which not only had to do with individual cases but which have to do with Canada's international relationships, directly affecting ourselves and Russia. I can