

them for the fact that world communism might send its agents here to try and subvert some of our governmental employees. What we can and do blame them for is that in the face of continuing appeals from all parties for an investigation of crime in its wider aspects, they have refused to do so. Now they have capitulated in such a way that in my opinion, the ministers who are concerned with this case, particularly the Minister of Justice, has been placed in an untenable situation. It seems almost an impossibility now for the Minister of Justice to carry on and do the work expected of him, while maintaining the confidence of this house and the public.

I do not intend to belabour this matter any further, Mr. Chairman, but in two respected newspapers today there are comments which I believe should be drawn to the attention of the committee. I believe these comments to be indicative of the situation as the general public sees it, putting this matter in its correct perspective. In the first place I would quote very briefly from an editorial in today's *Ottawa Journal*. It begins in this way:

Whether Mr. Spencer had too little or too much justice is something we may learn now that the government has granted the inquiry it should have granted months ago.

The editorial says later:

What possessed the Prime Minister to telephone Mr. Spencer. It is all like a bad movie, a James Bond sillied for juveniles. The R.C.M.P. could have checked Mr. Spencer's wishes as to that telegram, or the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Justice; or, better still, the Deputy Postmaster General whose department is the only one concerned with Mr. Spencer's complaints.

Mr. Spencer's complaints are not about security or injustice, they are that he was fired by his employer for reasons about which he is not satisfied and on terms which do not satisfy him. The editorial continues:

But no, the Prime Minister himself phones this dubious character and invites Mr. Lewis to listen in—

I think we can be thankful that the hon. member for York South had the common sense to refuse such an invitation. The editorial continues:

—pitiful pantomime of the propriety and processes of government.

We don't know yet whether Mr. Pearson and his government have offended the human rights of a man at the bottom but they have certainly offended the public's right to expect that the men at the top will do the right thing, in the right way, at the right time.

Today's edition of the *Globe and Mail* contains an editorial that I believe is perti-

Supply—Citizenship and Immigration  
nent and relevant as well at this time. It says:

It is impossible to believe that any government would hush up such a scandal—that the Conservatives would have dared to conceal it or that the Liberals would continue the conspiracy of silence only to refer to the sensational story when they themselves were cornered in an embarrassing security debate. If such were the case, substance would be added to the charge of former Justice Minister E. Davie Fulton that Mr. Cardin was making an approach to blackmail.

The editorial says later:

The tragedy, of course, is that we cannot much longer afford such federal blood-letting. Almost no legislation has been passed in this session of our parliament; our government is running out of money and must beg for supply; our provincial governments gain muscle every day while the federal house dissipates its strength.

"When discords and quarrels and factions are carried openly and audaciously," wrote Francis Bacon, "it is a sign the reverence of government is lost."

● (5:40 p.m.)

In such a time, said Bacon, men have need to 'pray for fair weather'. In March of 1966 we are indeed standing in such a need.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that regardless of these things the right hon. Prime Minister has chosen to capitulate to the demands of the opposition. I do not believe that should have been necessary. I believe the government had, in a lumbering way, presented its case. Nevertheless, the Prime Minister has done this and the hon. member for York South has withdrawn his motion of censure, because that is, in effect, what it was. I think the only action left to us in this house now is to let these estimates pass for this year, so that the business of the government can be carried on with the estimates for the next fiscal year, as well as budget matters and many other items of importance being placed before us.

**Mr. Starr:** Mr. Chairman, in view of what has transpired in the committee today, and the Prime Minister's statement, we withdraw our objection to the request that the motion be withdrawn.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Is it agreed by the committee that the motion put forward be now withdrawn?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION

1. Departmental administration, \$1,257,800.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall vote 1 carry?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.