

Supply—Justice

Justice that there is no more than that in our request. I am not concerned with all the political stuff that has been thrown at the minister by other members; I am not concerned in any of the controversy about whether or not he revealed the name or somebody else revealed the name, and I am not concerned to go back to Dorion, November 8, or anything else. The New Democrats in this parliament, for whom I now speak, are concerned that this board of review mentioned by the Prime Minister conduct the necessary hearing. We call it a judicial inquiry.

We are concerned to make sure that this man does have the chance to have his say before a third party. We are concerned to make sure that this parliament and this country are convinced that justice has in fact been done. I am not questioning—I want to make this clear—the sincerity of the minister; I am not questioning the sincerity of the Prime Minister; I am not questioning the efficiency and the competence of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I am not questioning any of these things. I am saying to the minister that this man, dismissed under section 50 of the Civil Service Act, had no opportunity for an independent review and we are here, as members of parliament, his employer.

We are not asking that this matter be taken to a court, because no one is questioning the legality of the government's action under section 50 of the Civil Service Act; the words are clear. What we are questioning is the morality of the action. What we are questioning is the dismissal of an employee by an employer without the employee's voice being heard by an independent tribunal. It will do no harm to the government, it will do no harm to the security of Canada to have that kind of hearing. I still appeal to the minister to have this kind of appeal.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question? I wonder whether the hon. member can envisage a situation in which section 50 would be pertinent; or does the hon. member allege that section 50 is redundant and should never be used?

● (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: First of all, if I had anything to do with it, section 50 would not be there because I do not think you need it. But let me say to the Minister of Agriculture, even though section 50 says you have a right to

[Mr. Lewis.]

dismiss, I think the law would put into that the concept of dismissal for cause; our system of justice would put into the words the concept of a fair, impartial hearing, because those things are basic to our system of justice. No matter what language the section uses, if a man is dismissed without a hearing that, in my opinion, is contrary to our way of life.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, unless I misunderstood the hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Groos: He did ask me a question, inasmuch as he asked if I could not consider the case of a shy, retiring person who would not bring forward any argument in his defence.

Mr. Lewis: I did not mean it as a question, but I do not mind it.

Mr. Groos: If I may make an observation, Mr. Chairman, I hardly think the actions of this man Spencer, who brought himself to the attention—

The Chairman: Order, it being ten o'clock, shall I rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again?

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—SUGGESTED STEP TO PROVIDE GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday on the orders of the day, I put this question to the Minister of Finance: In the preparation of the budget, is the minister looking at the negative income tax as one means of providing a guaranteed annual income? His Honour the Speaker thought it was a question that would be more appropriately placed on the order paper or, to use his words, discussed at a later hour. Well, the later hour has now come.

My purpose in putting this question to the Minister of Finance is to try to get the government to consider what is, to many people, still a new idea. It is not exactly a brand new idea, but it is one about which not