

*Oral Questions*

● (1432)

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. Does the minister realize that what he has just said illustrates how important this is to Newfoundland? While he may keep it separate in his mind, the United States does not have to. Other people who will be affected by his actions should be consulted. Is the minister saying that there are going to be no countervailing duties imposed on fish products from Newfoundland as a result of his discussions with the Secretary of State for the United States? Is that his statement?

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Speaker, I could give the hon. member that absolute assurance as of this moment if he would be prepared to support me in trying to avoid a reduction of two cents per pound to Newfoundland inshore fishermen for the rest of this fishing season. That is what is at issue. I can meet the United States clear across the board and get many plaudits from the United States and ensure that there is no connection. The need for me to do that, however, is very much circumscribed by the fact that I am conscious that we have said we will pay the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland a two-cent subsidy for the remainder of the fishing season.

The thing I am trying to negotiate is that if I assure the United States government that the subsidy will be ended by the end of this year and will not continue, will they then refrain from taking countervailing action? I cannot be sure that they will do that, of course. I would be a fool and I would also be unfair to the Newfoundland fishermen if I were to say at this time to the United States that I will stop the two-cent payment to Newfoundland fishermen. If the hon. member wants me to do that, let him say so now and we can get the whole matter resolved within 24 hours.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

#### TABLING OF DOCUMENTS IN PETER TREU CASE

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice. I understand the minister is prepared to give some indication to the House of his intentions with regard to documents in the Peter Treu case, what he will file, how, and why. I will give him that opportunity by requesting him to do so.

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I undertook to the hon. member the other day to table what I could. I am ready and able to table, later, the undertakings on bail and the statement of the judge on sentencing. While a political opponent, I think the hon. member would not want me either cited for contempt of court or charged under the Official Secrets Act. I am, of course, prevented from tabling the reasons for judgment, but I have instructed counsel to apply to the court for an order varying the order, and I hope

[Mr. Jamieson.]

the judgment can be tabled in this House because I think it would be helpful.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice tempts me with his observation about the Official Secrets Act. I should like to ask a supplementary question. Having in mind the comprehensive nature of this act, the fact that the minister, after two years of thorough and complete investigation by the authorities, laid two charges of the nature he did, that the act is wide enough that obviously many members of this House, including front benchers, members on this side and members of the press gallery have probably been in breach of the act from time to time, and having in mind that one year after the trial of Dr. Treu commenced he was awarded a contract by the NATO service centre—NATO being an organization of which Canada is still a member, unless the Prime Minister fixed that when he was away recently—and Dr. Treu is engaged in carrying out a contract for NATO at the present time, will the minister not agree that, under all these conditions, the interests of justice would be served if he instructed his counsel to agree to quash the existing conviction and sentence and agree to a new trial being held in the open, with full right reserved to the Crown to seek certain documents which may be sensitive and that certain evidence be kept out of the public eye?

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot accede to the hon. member's request. The case is under appeal at the present time. I think, obviously, that Dr. Treu should be permitted to pursue that process. At the commencement of the trial, both counsel in the case agreed to the necessity of the trial being in secret. I do not have a transcript of the proceedings, but I am informed that in a recent statement, counsel for Dr. Treu acknowledged at a seminar that while secret trials were unusual in our jurisprudence, this was the kind of case that required the evidence being taken in secret.

I would remind the hon. member that, difficult as it may be, the evidence in this case involved the NATO communications system. That is a military secret of the highest order, and there is no way, in the interests of NATO and of Canada, that it can be made public.

**Mr. Baldwin:** A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand that NATO is of a very sensitive military nature and that Dr. Treu is still working on a communications system which is in that sensitive area. This is one of the reasons that persuades me to ask this final question: Will the minister agree to facilitate the appearance of Dr. Treu before a committee of this House on matters external to the trial, keeping to one side the narrow issues of the trial, so that he might be able to give this House details of the harassment and the extent to which the facts of this case, outside of the trial itself, should be made public?

**Mr. Basford:** No, Mr. Speaker; first, of course, for the obvious technical reason that I am not in charge of committees of the House. Second, I have had no representations from his counsel to that effect, nor has my counsel had any such