

anything said in Ottawa. Since arrests were made the committee has been careful not to mention the names of men arrested or to allow anything affecting them as toll collectors to get on to the record. Some committee members have made a few slips but the chairman has corrected them. It can be said confidently that nothing done so far has prejudiced fair trials.

Judge Cloutier, the special judge conducting the preliminary inquiry here is fully aware of the danger of having two inquiries proceeding at the same time. When defence counsel tried to secure a delay in the preliminary inquiry Judge Cloutier remarked that "tension might be created by politicians pursuing a purpose other than that pursued here in court". He added that he had no intention of allowing outside pressures or tensions to invade the court. "The day when I see that such tension has become too strong, I shall reconsider."

What Judge Cloutier is saying is that he will see to it that the rights of the accused are not prejudiced. In effect he is telling the parliamentary committee that so long as it stays within its terms of reference its deliberations will not interfere with the conduct of the court cases. The proper course, then, is for the parliamentary committee to stay within its terms of reference, investigate the administration of the bridge, being careful not to bring into the hearings the names of persons now before the courts.

The reason I adopt that is that it concisely states my own feelings in words much quicker than perhaps I could do myself. Judge Cloutier is well aware of the hearings which are going on. Mr. Martin, who is well aware of the British traditions of justice is aware that the defence counsel will very quickly draw to the attention of the judge any subject matter that is sub judice. What Mr. Martin is doing is trying to bring in all such matters which are sub judice including this letter. What we as a committee are doing is trying to get on to the question where there is very little danger of infringing on matters which are sub judice.

As Mr. Baldwin said, it is up to the chairman and the members to see that nothing is done to disrupt the proceedings. For this reason I do not think this letter which Mr. Martin wants to read should be introduced at this time. It adds nothing and merely clouds the issue.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Mr. Chairman, you asked me not to read this letter.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want any lengthy editorials either.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): You have asked me not to read the letter. I have the strong view that the letter is one which should be read, but I will not add to your problems at this time. I will leave it to each member of this committee to consider whether, in the most objective assessment of our respective responsibilities, we can proceed to discharge our function by ignoring a letter which has been sent to this committee through the chairman from one of the counsel of the accused. However, the submissions of that counsel are there.

I now am saying to this committee—and I am sure the lawyer members of this committee will appreciate why I am saying this—we will regret in the months ahead if we take a decision contrary to that recommended to us last week by the chairman of this committee.

Anyone who has had some experience in the criminal courts knows I have not made a mis-statement when I made the one I have just made.