

Supply—Justice

Mr. Chairman, I say that the Prime Minister has led his Minister of Justice to the guillotine. It is the Prime Minister who is responsible for this situation, because he does not know how to make a decision when one is needed. He forgets that he is the Prime Minister of Canada and that he may no longer act like a mere diplomat. The Prime Minister must forget that he was a diplomat, he must devote his energies to making decisions.

In the Minister of Justice's place, Friday afternoon, I would simply have handed my resignation to the Prime Minister, because the latter had just placed him in an utterly intolerable situation. I did not understand the attitude of the Minister of Justice at that time.

That the Spencer case should crop up again today, that it should be decided to appoint a judge to investigate the facts, even going back to 15 or 20 years, to determine whether sabotage took place in 1944, 1951 or 1961, it is unthinkable that a Prime Minister should put on such a show at the expense of the Canadian people. We have already spent too much time on that matter and I hope those who are trying to make a political football out of the Spencer case will fail miserably.

We, in this group, want justice. We favour respect of human rights. We want a man implicated in something to have a chance to be heard. Until a man is proven guilty, we want him to have the benefit of the doubt. Apparently, this is not the case with Spencer, because after three weeks of debate and four weeks of questions on the order paper, there is a change of attitude.

It is not my intention to belabour the point. Nevertheless, if this situation is prevailing at present in parliament, the blame should not be put on the opposition but on the Prime Minister who could not take his own responsibilities at the proper time.

The other question in my mind is one mentioned Friday night by the Minister of Justice himself, the Munsinger affair. The Munsinger case was thrown like a charge, without warning, right here in the house, and no details were given. We ask for details. We do not know anything, but we hear all sorts of rumours about that. No charge should be made in this house without proof. Let this whole Munsinger matter be brought before the federal parliament. If there has been sabotage or spying, if ministers were involved, or a former minister of the previous government, as we hear it said in the corridors of parliament, let the light be made, but

no one should make all sorts of accusations while talking through his hat. When one makes such a serious charge in front of all the members, one should at least have the courage to give details.

We want equal justice for all, not only for a small group here and there, but for all. If there are things to be revealed in the better interest of the nation, of the Canadian parliament, let them be revealed, let that accusation be cleared up.

I urge the Minister of Justice to do away with discretion. He made charges in connection with a so-called Munsinger case. I ask the Minister of Justice to enlighten us as he is supposed to know something about it. Let him rise and tell us what he knows about the Munsinger case. With regard to Mr. Spencer, he has the opportunity of pleading his case before a judge appointed by the cabinet. And, in that connection, I say to the Prime Minister that Section 50 of the Civil Service Act is pretty worthless. If this section 50 gives no recourse to an accused, let us repeal it; let us keep and use section 60, which gives a right of appeal to an employee who is dismissed from the civil service for certain reasons. Then we will not look ridiculous in the eyes of the Canadian people.

In concluding my remarks, I ask the right hon. Prime Minister to come to a decision in due time so that we may no longer consider that we have been taken in.

● (5:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the hon. member for Villeneuve. Would the hon. member for Villeneuve permit this question. I have had a debate with myself about modesty, but modesty has lost. The first question on the unnatural surveillance of Spencer was asked by the member for Royal on January 19, the first day on which questions were allowed. I do not care who receives the credit, but I think the record should be straight.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the situation in which we presently are in this house borders almost on the ridiculous. The estimates for the year practically past have been under debate now for several weeks. There is a financial crisis. There is not money to pay for the administration of government and the situation daily becomes more critical. There is no money for the civil servants, there is no money for the military, and there is no money for the pensioners.