

the government also repealed one of our most fundamental laws, the right of every citizen to a fair and free trial. What is worse, the commissioners have taken away the good names and reputations of those who were found not guilty in the lower courts of the land. Here let me pay tribute to that standard of Canadian justice which will examine the evidence as it stands and not accept the judgment of those who occupy high positions in the judiciary.

As I said, the reputation of these people has been taken away. Many of them have lost their jobs. Perhaps all of them have lost their jobs and are finding it difficult to obtain new employment. Throughout all the days of their lives they will be pursued by the dark cloud of suspicion that at one time they may have been traitors to their country, and nothing which the government may do now can redress that wrong. Already their good names have been taken from them.

Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;  
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;  
But he that filches from me my good name  
Robs me of that which not enriches him,  
And makes me poor indeed.

We have not only left these people poor; we have left them paupers. We have destroyed their reputation; we have compelled them to use their savings or to borrow from their friends so that they could defend their names in Canadian courts; and the very least which can be expected is that the government will assume responsibility for this and pay the costs of those who were acquitted.

I should like to quote what the Prime Minister said last year, as reported at page 9 of *Hansard*:

I would also ask hon. members to remember in reading these reports that they have been prepared by two chief justices of the Supreme Court of Canada, gentlemen who, above all, would be anxious to maintain in every way possible the full freedom and liberty of individuals in our country.

I dispute the accuracy of that statement. Let me place beside it what Mr. Chitty had to say in the "Fortnightly Law Journal" of Toronto, which was reported about a year ago. Speaking of the politicians, he said:

They have abolished the constitution. They have deprived men and women of their constitutional rights not to be arrested uncharged, not to be held in prison unarraigned, not to have justice deferred or denied. They have subjected those men and women thus illegally arrested and imprisoned to inquisition and all that that implies. But beyond and above that they have destroyed the independence of the judiciary and suborned the courts to lend the appearance of legality to their crime.

[Mr. Stewart.]

I should like to say something more than that. Not only have the courts been suborned, but justice itself has been suborned and that by two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada. They found guilty those who were afterwards acquitted. They approached witnesses at times apparently, if one can read the evidence, with biased minds. They accepted and even created a commission which violated our most sacred rights.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I hate to interrupt my hon. friend, but I think that is not parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the minister rose, it was my intention to rise and call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he should be very careful in his expressions when referring to the supreme court.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I submit that the hon. gentleman is not dealing with judges; he is dealing with a commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is the same thing.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is a distinction.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. COLDWELL: Though the persons may be the same, the office they held or hold is different. The hon. member was discussing the commissioners; it is just an accident that they were judges.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That very point raised by my hon. friend came up years ago and it was not sustained at that time. I am sorry I have not the decision in hand at the moment. The procedure is that it is not proper to criticize judges even in their capacity as royal commissioners.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I respectfully point out that if the government wishes to escape criticism all it has to do is to appoint judges to a commission. That is wrong. If the government appoints justices to a commission, then these justices as commissioners must be subject to criticism in this house as commissioners.

Mr. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend is raising an entirely different point. The point he has raised has nothing whatsoever to do with the standing rules of the house. I submit that, according to the standing rules of the house, any reflection upon a member of a court is improper.

Mr. HACKETT: I should like to say a word on the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am going to begin by beseeching the hon. gentleman not to continue in the vein of his last utterance but I must submit that he has