

Supply—Justice

cut off, his pension is cut off and he remains under surveillance, which means partly in custody.

Is this man free? Is he as free as any member of this House of Commons? The answer to those questions is obviously no, because he is under surveillance and I want to know why. I suggest that he should be given a hearing.

Mr. Churchill: Can he leave the country?

● (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, that is another good question. Somebody asked, could he leave the country? He probably cannot leave the place where he lives. This is what the *Brandon Sun* said in connection with the Spencer case:

The man's reputation is ruined. He has been named. The Minister of Justice has stated that he gave information to the Russians. But the justice minister will not give him the satisfaction of having his case tried.

Those on the other side of the chamber talk about hearings. They went a long way in this regard at one time. I remember the Minister of Transport said when we were dealing with the Coyne affair that it was a terrible thing for Mr. Coyne, it was against the Bill of Rights, that he did not receive a hearing in the House of Commons, even if he had one in the Senate. If the law is to be applied for one person in Canada who holds a high position, is it right for Mr. Spencer to be denied the same privilege?

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Bow River but the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the Chair now understand that the hon. member should continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This article in the *Brandon Sun* goes on to say:

The man's reputation has been ruined, and for all anyone knows, he may not even have done what the justice minister says he did. And even if he did do it, the justice minister apparently feels that what he did was not serious enough to merit prosecution.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Then the writer of this newspaper article says:

This is a ridiculous situation.

I say it is ridiculous and preposterous. The article continues:

We have a man whose integrity is in question, who is being shadowed like a criminal, and yet who has done nothing, apparently, to merit prosecution under the Criminal Code. The worst that can be said is that he was guilty of poor taste and bad judgment for giving information to Soviet agents. And yet we do not even know that he did that! Has Mr. Cardin come down with a case of Favreautitis? Are incompetence and forgetfulness an occupational hazard of justice ministers? It would appear so, and that appearance will linger until all the facts are known.

That appearance will linger until this man has been given a hearing, even though it be in camera. Let us look at the *Globe and Mail*. They are just as critical. Similar articles appeared in all our national newspapers. They are critical because they realize, as I am sure the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice realize, that the most important civil right is liberty as I described it this afternoon in the definition given by Dean Cronkite, formerly of the University of Saskatchewan, and the words used by the Hon. Mr. Powers, former cabinet member at the time another spy case was being investigated.

The article in the *Globe and Mail* says:

The justice minister at the same time said that Spencer would be kept under surveillance so long as he remained in Canada, which would seem to mean for the rest of his life, since he is a Canadian.

The question to be asked is, how long is this man to remain under surveillance? When will he be able to throw off the cloak and the umbrella, if ever? The article continues:

He has been dismissed from his job in the post office, cut off from pension, without right of appeal.

I shall deal with that question once more. Surely the fact that he received a hearing before the Civil Service Commission has nothing to do with his rights as a citizen of this nation to have determined the question of whether he is guilty or innocent of the charge of espionage.

Mr. Douglas: He did not even have an appeal before the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Woolliams: No, he had no appeal; and we never know what influence is used in that regard. The article in the *Globe and Mail* then says:

That the surveillance, the dismissal from the job and the decision not to prosecute still stand, was confirmed in the house yesterday by Mr. Cardin.