

Official Secrets Act

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED LIMITATION ON SCOPE OF OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved:

That this House notes with concern the secret trial to Alexander Peter Treu and the harassment of the *Toronto Sun* and its editor, Peter Worthington, under the provisions of the Official Secrets Act, and urges the establishment of a special committee of this House to recommend such changes in the Act as will limit its scope to matters directly related to national security and defence.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members will note that the proceedings on this motion shall expire at the ordinary hour of adjournment later this day, in accordance with the terms of section 11 of Standing Order 58.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise first on a point of order before time starts ticking against me. Certain documents were tabled yesterday by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Young) and in tabling them he said, as reported at page 6189 of *Hansard*:

I would add, Mr. Speaker, that I am tabling the remarks at sentence in French only as we have no authority to produce an official translation of such court documents.

My office telephoned the office of the judge, and I spoke to the people there who said that so far as they were concerned that is a lot of nonsense and they have no objection at all to the documents being translated into English. After preliminary examination of these documents—it is the first time I have had a chance to pull back the curtain and have a look at what lies beneath—I think it is very important that these documents should be made available. It may well be that the House might agree at this time that the remarks of the trial judge with respect to the sentencing be appended to *Hansard*. They would then be available in both French and English for all people who are interested, and I commend them as very important reading to all members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I would presume that any reluctance on the part of the government to do the translation was not related to a lack of permission but rather to an unwillingness to accept the responsibility for the translation of a document which might come under contest. I notice that the Parliamentary

[Mr. Lang.]

Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Young) is prepared to respond.

I have no objection to accepting the document on behalf of the House in any way that would facilitate its translation in our area of responsibility. We do it as a matter of regular course with those documents that are filed and are either referred to in debate in such a way as to require translation or, alternatively, are appended to *Hansard* so that they require translation. I think that should be done, unless the Department of Justice will proceed with the translation.

Mr. Roger Young (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think you have touched exactly on the point I would have mentioned. I do not think there is any objection on the part of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) either to translating the document or having members of the opposition translate the words that I tabled yesterday, from French to English. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has mentioned a phone call and told us of the response that there was no objection to the translation.

I would point out that this is an entirely different issue from whether I or the Minister of Justice could have provided the House with an “official” translation. I do not think we could have done that. It was our belief that we could not specifically provide an official translation of the remarks by the court. We could do a translation and hon. members opposite could do one, but whether that would be accepted as “official” on the part of court officials is, I think, a completely different matter.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the parliamentary secretary then give consent to having the document which was tabled by him yesterday appended to today's *Hansard*? That would leave very simply the question of translation where it belongs, with the House. I would be as willing to accept the translation of the House as I would that of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker I have no objection to the document being appended to *Hansard* (and thereby translated.)

● (1212)

Mr. Speaker: The House is agreed. Then we will order that the document shall be appended to today's *Hansard*, in which case we can commence at once on the translation of it. There are parts of the document which should be given prioritized treatment. Perhaps that can be related to further comment. In any case, we will agree and so order that the documents tabled by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) yesterday, in respect of the Alexander Peter Treu case, be appended to today's *Hansard*. The result of that will be that we will commence translation at once.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: For text of document above referred to, see Appendix.]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate at once that I am glad we have been provided with the opportunity for this debate today. While I may have lost a skirmish yesterday,