

*Supply—Justice*

so that one becomes lost in emptiness and is no longer able to see the virtues. One is caught in perfection itself.

Mr. Chairman, this is what happens more or less on both sides of the house.

There is another thought of Pascal, a little shorter, this one, that I might apply to those who lend passion to this debate and I quote:

Man is neither angel nor beast, and unfortunately he who would act the angel acts the beast.

This, up to a point, is what we have here; passions are roused on both sides in an attempt to prove equally and entirely virtuous.

Yet there are questions to be raised. The Spencer case is not anything new. There have been similar cases in the past and it would be interesting to know what happened then.

I was surprised to hear the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin) formally and openly dare in this house the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to refer to certain action he took when he was leader of the government in order to establish whether the same thing had not happened at that time. Among other things, mention was made of the Monseignor case which took place when the Leader of the Opposition was Prime Minister. Both cases are reported to be almost similar. It is hard to learn much about this matter, because the ministers, as far as I can see, feel bound by their oath of secrecy. Even though they are cornered, they make every effort not to divulge anything. It is rather by other persons that the truth could be known.

Since the Minister of Justice made reference to the Monseignor case in today's debate, I should like to ask him whether it involved national security as the Spencer case now before the house? In the Monseignor case, did Canadian citizens suffer penalties such as Spencer is suffering, without any proceedings or other form of inquiry? Did the same thing occur in a possibly similar case while the present Leader of the Opposition was in power? Is it not true that in the Monseignor case the Prime Minister of the day intervened personally to avoid prosecution and judicial inquiry? And when I say intervene, I insist on saying "intervene personally."

Since the leader of the opposition has just resumed his seat, I might perhaps repeat the questions I asked before he entered the house. He might then give us the answers to the questions I put with regard to the Monseignor case?

Here was the first: Was that case one of national security, like the Spencer case now

being studied? In that case, were sanctions imposed upon individuals without their having had the privilege of a trial or judicial inquiry similar to the one now requested? Might it not be that the former Prime Minister intervened personally so that proceedings or an inquiry might be avoided?

In the Monseignor case, did the former Prime Minister not ask that some facts be not revealed and that some actions be concealed, saying that it was necessary for the security of the country, exactly as the cabinet claims now? In the Monseignor case, were not certain individuals, at the request of the former Prime Minister, found out or kept out of the inquiry so that they would not be incriminated? Did the former Prime Minister not act like this after being influenced by certain individuals or certain people who had no connection with the cabinet, the Justice Department or the House of Commons?

The answers to these questions would likely enlighten us in the case now under consideration. If the Leader of the Opposition would tell us why some members of the opposition behaved in such a way, we might understand why the cabinet is behaving otherwise today.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, as far as we are concerned, we are still puzzled. There is a motion before us, and I know that members of our group are still wondering who is right and who is wrong. We are seeking the truth, we do not want to condemn an individual unfairly but, on the other hand, we do not want the security of the state to be threatened either, in order to protect an individual who is not actually worth it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a point which I believe was raised by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis); anyway that point is reported in today's *Ottawa Journal* in which it is said that there are now two lawyers working on the case. If my understanding of the newspaper item is correct, those lawyers, one of which is Mr. John Laxton, have been appointed by the New Democratic Party to defend the interests of this Mr. Spencer. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I suggested three or four days ago during consideration of the estimates of the Department of Justice: if someone believes initiatives should be taken and Spencer's rights defended before the courts, let him do it.

I mentioned that if the same thing had happened in the constituency of Lapointe, I