

Supply—Justice

attitude, realizing that these young people represent our greatest asset, and that if we fail to do our best for them we are wasting that asset.

I have before me a reprint of an address made by Mr. MacLeod, commissioner of the Canadian penitentiary service, headed "Juvenile Delinquency, Just a Legal Problem". There is one short statement in this address I should like to read because I believe it sets out the motive that should prompt us in all our studies and activities in this regard. Mr. MacLeod, the commissioner, states:

The basic concern, I believe, stems from the adult fear that the child will not achieve his full potential in life; that indiscretions, sown in youth, will yield a harvest of lost opportunity in later life; and at the worst that the juvenile delinquent will, in time, become the adult offender.

I trust that in the spirit set out in that brief paragraph all who are concerned with this problem will work together in an endeavour to solve it, in the interests of all our young people and our nation as a whole. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is incumbent upon me to say at least a few words during our consideration of these estimates, and to make some reference to what at the present time may be known as the Spencer incident or case. I can assure you that what I have to say is entirely different from what I intended to say some 15 to 20 minutes ago. I say that because of the announcement just made by the right hon. Prime Minister regarding this situation.

That eminent journalist Mr. Lynch wrote in his column a couple of days ago that as a result of an answer given to a question I had put on the order paper I rose in this house in a howl of fury and said that the Minister of Justice had tried to lynch Winch by stating that he did not think Mr. Spencer would be very happy about his new found friends, and that he did not want an inquiry. Perhaps Mr. Lynch should get a new crystal ball because Mr. Spencer has made it clear that he does want an inquiry.

May I also point out to Mr. Lynch that I am not a new found friend of Mr. Spencer as a result of this case being taken up in the House of Commons, which is of great importance to all Canadians. I know that I am the only member of this house who can say that Mr. Spencer is his constituent, because he has lived for years in the constituency of Vancouver East. I have also known Mr. Spencer personally for many, many years. He has been in my home on a number of occasions. I

[Mr. Patterson.]

have met him at numerous meetings when he was fighting on behalf of the postal workers. As a matter of fact, that is how I first met Mr. Spencer. I received a phone call from him saying that he could no longer remain quiet about the wages and working conditions of the post office employees of the federal government. He came down to my home and gave me first hand details. I think he was the first militant person to speak out on behalf of the postal employees in British Columbia.

From that first meeting we advanced to meetings which involved an official delegation from Vancouver, Burnaby, New Westminster and the Fraser Valley. These meetings eventually paid off and something was done for the postal employees of this country.

I wanted to bring those facts to the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, because it indicates that I am only interested in the general nature of situations such as Mr. Spencer now finds himself in, and that I speak with a knowledge of a constituent of mine.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I want to emphasize that much as I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister I am still not happy, I am still not completely satisfied about this matter. I sincerely believe that far too many questions have been left unanswered. I find it very, very difficult to understand a situation wherein an announcement was made some 18 months ago that a Canadian citizen in the federal civil service was a traitor to Canada, was guilty of espionage, that the government had the evidence to such an extent that two diplomats or employees of a foreign country's embassy were ordered home without complaint from the embassy, where there was a record of \$3,000 or \$4,000 being paid to a civil servant by a foreign power as a result of this espionage, where he was put under surveillance for the rest of his life, but there is not enough proof to lay a charge of espionage.

However, Mr. Chairman, there may be and there must be some peculiar, fantastic reasons for this being the case. What hits very close to home in my mind is that if the situation is such that no charge can be laid or will be laid, on what basis is the man found guilty? He must be guilty or he would not have been fired from his job as a clerk, a lowly clerk in the post office, he would not have lost his pension rights, his unemployment insurance rights and be placed under surveillance. I wish to stress that even if I do not know all the details and do not have all