

*Supply—Justice*

would have sought personally to ensure justice to a fellow-citizen.

Well, I now see that the New Democratic Party has taken that initiative and has put Spencer's case into the hands of a Vancouver lawyer, Mr. John Laxton, and the hon. member for York South added in his press conference:

● (3:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

He has retained Vancouver lawyer John Laxton and Mr. Cardin agreed to instruct the R.C.M.P. to make Spencer available to Mr. Laxton.

[*Translation*]

Considering, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Justice agreed to a lawyer meeting Mr. Spencer to deal with this case, is this not the best procedure? Now that lawyers are handling the Spencer case, is it necessary for parliament to launch an inquiry?

I think it is desirable to let lawyers defend the rights and privileges of Spencer, since the Minister of Justice himself agreed to let lawyers handle it.

Further in the article, it is said that another lawyer—I think he is also a lawyer—Harry Raskin, of Vancouver, is also personally handling the Spencer case.

I think that parliament should be satisfied that lawyers are not prevented from dealing with the Spencer case.

But, Mr. Chairman, what strikes me is the vindictiveness with which some hon. members go after some French speaking ministers. I rose a little earlier but I could not speak because the committee was considering a motion. I must say that I did not like the meanness shown by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau) did not rise; he did not have the right to speak. Nothing was heard. So he gets up and states for all to hear in the house that the President of the Privy Council had just said something that was not even official.

But, the microphone on that side was dead since the hon. member for Yukon had the floor. The minister was not on his feet. Now, let the hon. member for Yukon tell us if, in the case of the former Postmaster General, after Justice Dorion said: "Anyone who harmed his reputation should apologize", he apologized. He blamed the other minister but he never apologized to the former Postmaster General, the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay). Today, since it is urgent to pass the estimates, claiming that nothing official had been said, he tried to get

[Mr. Grégoire.]

another one to his knees, asking him to apologize, when he himself has never had the courage and intestinal fortitude to apologize to another one whose reputation was clear and whom he went after in this house and outside.

The hon. member for Yukon should justify his behaviour. I was the first one in the house to take him to task. Well, no, this is forgotten. On the other hand, the hon. member for Yukon has started a lot of rumours in the last seven or eight days about the Department of Justice. I could read the statements of February 8, in Victoria, in *Le Droit* or *Le Devoir* on February 9, 1966:

I have a list showing the names of the companies implicated and the names of the individuals involved in the matter.

Why did he not bring it? He says that everything is mentioned in the Dorion report. No, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing said about fraudulent bankruptcies in the Dorion inquiry.

The hon. member for Yukon was saying, and this makes him even closer. The *Journal* of February 8, 1966:

[*English*]

He said he will present this evidence in the House of Commons when he returns to Ottawa later this week.

[*Translation*]

That was three weeks ago, and still no evidence.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that we are seeing the biggest deflated balloon since confederation. Oh, he had a very high reputation and all the newspaper men said: "That is the man who brought about the Dorion inquiry".

But here, there is no sign of the names and lists which he claims to have. Where are they?

Mr. Chairman, I shall quote a beautiful thought of Pascal's—good even though it is old:

The mind of this man who sits on judgment on the world is not so independent that he cannot be disturbed by the first noise he hears. There is no need of cannon fire to prevent him from thinking: the noise of a weathercock or a pulley is enough. Do not be surprised if now he cannot reason properly; a fly is buzzing in his ear; that is enough to make him incapable of giving good advice.

In Pascal, Mr. Chairman, we find a great many wonderful thoughts. Here is one. I should like to digress in order to quote another one which fits the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) perfectly. It is so right and accurate that you will not fail