

Mr. McPHILLIPS: For what purpose are these men being made available? Are they the men who made the investigation?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McPhillips, we have to investigate the Victoria bridge as well as the Jacques Cartier bridge.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: Surely we do not want to get on to the Victoria bridge at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: We cannot obtain other witnesses at the present time. They will not be available until next Tuesday. As these men are available, we thought we could proceed with them on Thursday. We will have other witnesses for next Tuesday.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: How about this man, Mr. Shea? Was he not an investigator?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON: He was here last week.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shea was here in regard to the Jacques Cartier bridge, and Mr. Chevrier wants to ask him some more questions. He was not finished with him, and wants him back again.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: You denied it this morning, Mr. Chairman. You said we are not bound by the steering committee; now you are saying we are going to get the witnesses to which the steering committee agrees. I do not agree. We should be told who these witnesses are and on what facts they are going to give evidence. In this way we would be prepared to question them. My view is that it is the height of folly to go headlong into the Victoria bridge now, as we have not nearly completed the Jacques Cartier bridge.

The CHAIRMAN: No, but we can get these three witnesses now. I believe Mr. Shea can come, and his evidence concerns the Jacques Cartier bridge.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: What are they going to talk about? Are they toll collectors, executives, counsel, or what are they?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Henderson is the general manager of road transport for the C.N.R., and Mr. Côté is assistant general solicitor for the C.N.R. Mr. Donald Gordon suggested that they be called.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: I do not see what Donald Gordon has to do with it. What is the use of a C.N.R. solicitor?

The CHAIRMAN: It concerns the Victoria bridge, and these are the men Mr. Gordon thought would know more about it than anyone else.

Mr. McPHILLIPS: I must say that I do not follow it, but if the steering committee is sold on it, I will not object unduly.

The CHAIRMAN: In regard to this letter, Mr. Martin, as chairman I personally feel that owing to the fact that the solicitor who wrote it is the solicitor for the accused, it might have more to do with affecting the case than anything else, and I do not know whether we should discuss it at the present time. That is my feeling on it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I make a suggestion to you. If that is your feeling, I am sure none of us here would want to quarrel deeply with it; but do you not think the matter should be referred to the steering committee, in light of the discussion that has taken place, so they may consider it and decide what action, if any, should be taken?

The CHAIRMAN: The steering committee decided that they would put it before this committee, and I am just afraid that questions might be asked, in regard to this letter, which might have something to do with the case.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): I would support the suggestion made by Mr. Chevrier, on the understanding, however, that it does not preclude the raising