

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Campbell will withdraw it, without any restrictions. Is that right, Mr. Campbell?

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Providing there is no further obstruction.

The CHAIRMAN: I know that Mr. Martin will not try to obstruct anything. Mr. Baldwin is next.

Mr. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting through practically all these committee meetings. I doubt very much if anything has been said—and I am giving it as my opinion as counsel, having appeared in a great number of criminal trials—except possibly one brief reference to one of the persons as an accused, at the time that one of his time-sheets was produced, which would, in my opinion, in any way be detrimental or prejudicial to his trial.

I think we have got to consider, what do we mean by *sub judice*? Quite frequently, when criminal offences are committed, there is a press report given of them. People in the community from whom a jury will be drawn know an offence has been committed. What this committee has attempted to do—and I am sure we agree in this respect—is this: We have had a large field to cover, and in covering the field we have touched, probably, on subject matters which might be close, or even relevant, to the criminal offence of theft which these people are facing. But that has been purely accidental.

The subject matter of this inquiry is the administration of the bridge. If, in the course of that, we discover that there have been some irregularities which may be referable to administrative or ministerial neglect, well then, it is our duty to make an inquiry into that. But as to the fact that there is a criminal trial taking place in Montreal, the subject matter of that is: These people are charged with committing a certain offence. It is not whether there has been an offence of theft or irregularities on the bridge. The question is: Are these particular six individuals, or any one of them, guilty of committing that offence? Only to the extent that we come close to that, I think, is what we are doing here to be construed as *sub judice*.

I feel there is no reason why we should not proceed, provided that once it becomes apparent that we are approaching that subject matter the chairman is vigilant in his duty; and it is the duty of the members of the committee to make certain the questions they frame are in no way touching on that matter. The chairman would be doubly vigilant to see that nothing is done in that regard. Apart from that, I think we would be most ill advised to withdraw from these proceedings at this time.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Baldwin has made a very—

The CHAIRMAN: We have just about two or three minutes.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): I think Mr. Baldwin has made a very fair and objective statement, and I am sure we all appreciate how helpful he has been in the matter.

I would ask Mr. Baldwin to just think of these words of Mr. Pigeon at the last meeting. If they do not justify the argument that I have put forward this morning, then I will be surprised.

Here is what Mr. Pigeon said:

Je pensais que, par le fait qu'il a été prouvé qu'il y avait eu du vol et du coulage, c'était suffisant pour permettre aux membres du Parlement de continuer l'enquête, c'est tout.

For this reason—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Translation!