

Supply—Justice

Mr. Woolliams: I will answer a question when I am finished, and I am just about finished.

An hon. Member: Tory arrogance.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: If that is arrogance, then I have a lot of friends with me and they are not all sitting on this side. When did you decide not to give him an inquiry? When did you decide to release his name? Was that a plan of the government before the minister went on television, or was it a slip of the tongue on his part? When did the two Russians who were connected with the case come to Canada? Were they in Canada before the minister's party was asked to form the government of this country? Let us hear answers to those questions.

I have watched the minister weigh his words. I do not say this unkindly to him, but he reads his speech because he wants it to read well in *Hansard* and does not want any mistakes. When the minister went on television he was told to release that name. This was a plan conceived by the Liberal party, a plan of the Liberal government, and that is the reason it was done.

Mr. Sharp: Why?

Mr. Woolliams: I will tell you why. You covered up the terms and conditions of the Dorion report, and swept it under the rug so that you would win the last election. I was asked for the reason and that is it.

Mr. Roxburgh: We do not take you too seriously.

Mr. Sharp: Just another fairy story.

Mr. Woolliams: The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that is another fairy story. I heard him admit on the radio that the Conservative party was right; and I use that in answer to him.

Mr. Winters: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, I did not say a word.

Mr. Woolliams: It was the Minister of Finance. I forgot there had been a substitution. It happens so often that it is hard to keep track. The Minister of Finance said that the Tory party was right, that the government or Canada could have sold far more grain, but that transportation under the Liberals broke down, and the western farmer has to pay the price. He has already made that admission on television.

Mr. Sharp: The railways lost confidence during the Conservative regime and they did not build the equipment.

Mr. Woolliams: I would have thought the Minister of Finance would be able to give a better retort than that. He said the railways broke down under the Conservative government. It seems to me that the C.P.R. run this government, but when we were the government we ran the country. That is the answer to that.

An hon. Member: Yes, ran it right into the ground.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I think we have a very good railway system in Canada, but we should resume consideration of our system of justice.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I got derailed. Anyhow, they are certainly railroading Mr. Spencer. That is the point I really had in mind, and I knew I would be able to draw an analogy there.

When the minister was answering questions this afternoon he said that only \$3,000 or \$4,000 was paid over to provide travel warrants from here to there so that the boys could get certain information. However, when the communiqué was released on May 9, 1965 it said thousands of dollars had been spent.

I think the minister should have told us how much money was paid to the other people connected with this matter, if there were others, and how much money was paid in total. If that information can be made available when he speaks I think he should give the full information. He would not have been embarrassed this afternoon to give any of these answers, had he done what the Prime Minister wanted to do but refused to do in the matter, namely hold an inquiry in camera in order to give this man a fair hearing.

Let me conclude on this note. We are not concerned tonight with this one man. It may be sad for Mr. Spencer; I do not know. I do not know whether he is guilty or innocent. But the fact is that every minister of justice, as I suppose do the courts, can refer back to precedents, and tonight we will be establishing a precedent. If this case should become a precedent for this House of Commons or for future governments, it means this, Mr. Chairman, that in future every man who becomes connected with a similar set of circumstances as Mr. Spencer, even though he discloses the facts to the proper legal