be given to members of parliament? This hardly seems to me to be the way a democracy should function.

Mr. Aiken: No, I would not condone that at all, if that be the case. I would not think it a proper use of this particular organization or of the services of the mounted police if that were so. Unfortunately, I do not feel that we can expect them to admit or deny it.

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon, member who has just taken his seat permit me to ask him a question. The question which comes to my mind is whether he would agree that we should be able to know whether or not the R.C.M.P. is giving information to a voluntary organization which it is not prepared to give to the members of this house. It seems to me that is the nub of the question which is being asked by the hon, member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher). It has nothing to do, in my submission, either with the argument advanced by the last speaker or by the parliamentary secretary. I think this is an important question.

Mr. Aiken: Perhaps we are trying to do indirectly what could not be done directly. If the question: "What organizations are considered communist-dominated, and what publications are so classed?" were put on the order paper, I do not suppose it would be answered.

Mr. Fisher: For the information of the hon. member I might tell him that I have put such a question on the order paper for a number of years, and the response of the government is always that it is not their policy to do this. More than one minister of justice has given this same reply; also the parliamentary secretary has this afternoon confirmed it.

Mr. Aiken: In reply to the last three questions—I am not going to talk the motion out—the overriding consideration in this situation must be the security of the nation. I do not think we can direct the R.C.M.P. as to how they operate. If they choose to operate in this manner, then I do not think we can prevent it. For example, if we asked the C.I.A. either to acknowledge or deny that they had anything to do with the flying of explosives into Cuba by the two Canadians who were recently arrested there, I do not think they would do so, and I certainly would not expect them to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Shall I call it six o'clock? I must advise the house that the hour for consideration of private members' business has expired. Before I call it six o'clock may we revert to committee and resume the business interrupted at five o'clock.

Supply—External Affairs
SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Batten in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

1. Departmental administration, \$7,648,800.

The Deputy Chairman: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 7 p.m.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, at the time of adjournment of this discussion I was dealing with the question of admission to the organization of American states. I am not going to say any more on that point except to refer to a pamphlet issued by the Canadian-American committee entitled "Canada and the Organization of American States". The minister, of course, is thoroughly conversant with this pamphlet in which the arguments both pro and con are given.

In summary, the arguments in favour of membership are that Canada would play a constructive part in international diplomacy in the western hemisphere and have closer trading and economic relations. Both these arguments are cogent ones. As already stated, during our period in office we greatly extended the field of our relationship with these countries in the western hemisphere. We realize, as all hon members realize, that we are indeed in the western hemisphere and that the interests of the countries within that hemisphere are our interests.

On the other hand, the arguments cited against are first, as already pointed out, that Canada would be placed in an awkward position. Then there is the political argument that the commonwealth connection weighs against full Canadian participation. There is the argument that membership would be costly and a heavy burden. We would also find ourselves involved politically in every disagreement, difficulty or revolution in central or South America. In the organization a decision is binding on all if it is supported by two thirds of the members, but consent to use armed forces is not governed by the same majority vote. The cumulative effect of the demand that we participate in insurrection, revolution, rebellion or other internal difficulty is something that we in Canada should not assume unless there are advantages far outweighing the potential difficulties that caused us to delay and to defer taking action. The