

Supply—Justice

situation, although I have some questions which normally or naturally come to the mind of one who has not yet formed an opinion.

The first would be the following: Did any person, any individual, any member of the opposition or of the party in power ever express the desire to meet this Mr. Spencer personally? Did those who made pompous speeches a few moments ago in defence of Spencer's rights—I refer to the hon. members for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) and Royal (Mr. Fairweather)—ever express the wish or tried to meet him, to have clear ideas about him? Were they prevented or forbidden to meet Spencer?

Is it true that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), when he went to British Columbia, tried to question Spencer? Was he prevented from doing so? Was he able to meet him?

Mr. Chairman, in another of his questions, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) stated that the treatment given Spencer violates his famous Canadian bill of rights.

Did anybody in opposition or the Leader of the Opposition himself put himself or offer to put himself at the disposal of Spencer to help him demand his rights, insist upon his rights, since such rights were recognized by Parliament?

To defend Spencer's rights. Did the right hon. Leader of the Opposition or the hon. members for Yukon, Bow River or Royal offer to take Spencer's case in their own hands to demand his rights before Parliament, under the Canadian bill of rights?

And if Spencer is not guilty, are there any lawyers within the Conservative party who offered to help him, legally speaking? If Spencer loses his pension rights and if he has a right to a pension, he therefore undergoes a damage which gives him recourse before civil courts.

Did the hon. member for Bow River, a brilliant lawyer, at least when there is no client, no accused and no accuser, at least in this House in short, when there are no cases entrusted to him, offer to take this case into his own hands and attempt to defend Spencer's rights to a pension before the courts?

Is there a lawyer within the Conservative party who offered his services to help Spencer?

Mr. Grafftey: Yes, here, in the parliament of Canada.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, should one of my rights be violated, I would at once bring the case before a Canadian court of law. I have enough trust in Canadian courts to know that if a Canadian is being denied his rights or privileges the courts of law will recognize the fact even against the government and the Minister of Justice.

The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) should know our justices and courts are impartial, that they follow long established procedures, and that we can trust our justice.

And yet where is the lawyer, if there be one, who is moved by Mr. Spencer's rights more than by vulgar demagogy? If there is one including the hon. member for York-South (Mr. Lewis) of the N.D.P., if there is one who is sincere about defending Mr. Spencer, why does he not rise and bring the courts of Canada to recognize Mr. Spencer's rights? What is keeping him from doing this? Nothing.

Mr. Lewis: The Supreme Court of Canada is here, this is the court of our land.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, we know that before going to the supreme court, you must start with the superior court, and the court of appeal; then you go to the supreme court. Everyone knows that prior to going before 265 judges in parliament, you go before a single judge of the superior court and before three judges of the court of appeal. But what are we looking for? What is being asked? An investigation? Justice, could be had before the Canadian courts.

Therefore, it is not for us to render justice but rather to see that justice is done in Canada. If an hon. member wants so badly to protect the rights of Mr. Spencer, he should get up and defend the rights of Mr. Spencer before the Canadian courts.

Moreover—and it is significant—how is it that that a former Minister of Justice in this house, who is aware of such cases of national security since some undoubtedly came up while he was in office, did not even deem it necessary to touch upon that subject when he took part in the debate on the estimates of the Department of Justice? How is it that he did not say a word about it? And yet, if there is in the Conservative party a member who