

*Supply—Justice*

known that other members have been a little jealous of those redheads. However, I must congratulate the hon. member for St. John's West upon his speech and I hope the Liberal party will call a caucus tomorrow. They surely do not have to wait until Wednesday, because the member who has just spoken seemed to answer a number of questions very honestly. He said he thought a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or a trial judge of a high court should review a matter such as this. The hon. member said he did not think the holding of an inquiry should apply to Spencer, the reason being that it might be interpreted as having a political motive.

I think that was the whole crux of his argument, namely that such action might be interpreted as having a political motive. I believe if there are any political motives attached to this question they are held by the Liberal party because, as I said on Wednesday last and I repeat it now, the government has something to cover up; it has swept the matter under the carpet; it does not want to bring this question out into the open. That is exactly what the hon. member for St. John's West tried to say tonight, but he did not want to go too far in speaking of his own party.

We listened with great interest to the minister. I make a special appeal to him because as I understand it from reading something about the minister's background—and I think he will like what I am about to say—he comes from a very traditional and great family in his own province and in this nation. He is a lawyer; he has some great traditions arising out of his family's background and is able to appreciate the legal principles involved in this case, namely those which are wrapped up in the rights of the individual in respect of civil liberties.

I hope that with those traditions behind him, and as a new Minister of Justice who came in with a new brush, he will not be just a pawn in the hands of the Prime Minister. I hope that because the Prime Minister says "We do not want an investigation in this case" the Minister of Justice has not become a pawn and just says "We must not have an investigation in this case".

When you analyse the arguments put forward this afternoon by the Minister of Justice, and his reasons for not having an inquiry held in this matter, you find them very weak. I find them very political. I find that all the reasons he put forward this afternoon make a mockery of justice. If he is, as I

suggest he is, steeped in the great legal traditions of a great family background, let him now measure up to those traditions and the responsibility of the portfolio he holds, one of the main portfolios in government. Let him measure up to those responsibilities and give this man his day in court. Let the minister hold an inquiry into this case, as was suggested by the hon. member for St. John's West.

Let us compare this case with similar cases in the past. Hon members opposite keep saying that this case is on all fours with cases of espionage that occurred when the Conservatives were in office or when the Liberals were formerly in office. The hon. member for St. John's West referred to this type of justice, as I understood it, being the Canadian way—not the Conservative way, the Liberal way or the New Democratic party way. There is a difference between this case and others in the past. The minister this afternoon said no, there was not; but he might reconsider his position when he sees the fine distinction that can be drawn between this case and others.

What is that fine distinction? Several other hon. members raised the matter by their questions of the previous speaker. The distinction is that no one has ever been named in this manner before. I am not concerned tonight with the narrow, political side of the question and whether the minister named this man or somebody else did it. I am concerned with the fact that he has been named and the minister named him over the national television network. Therein lies the difference.

Hon. members opposite have said that you cannot have that kind of inquiry in this kind of case because you cannot have a proper investigation of the facts if they are made public. Let us compare this case with the ordinary case where there is a reasonable belief that someone is guilty of a crime under the Criminal Code and the police go out, make an investigation, interrogate the accused and ascertain certain facts. In this case the facts were referred to the legal officers of the Department of Justice. The Minister of Justice seems to want to hide behind this fact, because he says the law officers of the crown said there was not enough evidence to warrant a prosecution. It is true enough that if the Attorney General or the Minister of Justice, as the case may be, is advised that in an ordinary case—I am dealing with the ordinary case at the moment—there is not enough

[Mr. Woolliams.]