

To read that as a threat to parliament when the man is saying, "that it seems to us that it would be preferable", overblows quite dramatically the meaning of the words and their context. I would suggest that one—and again I would stress I have to read from a translation because I have not seen the original in the language in which it was spoken, and you, Mr. Speaker, have pointed out a difference, a nuance in the language in which it was originally spoken from what appears in the translation—one has to be thin-skinned to put the character into the words that has been put. I think it is tempest which has been overblown at this time.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax):** I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. My concern is with the attitude taken by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and his parliamentary assistant. In a sense, I am almost more concerned about their attitude than I am about the original question that was raised.

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

**Mr. Stanfield:** The argument raised by the Minister of Justice was entirely spurious and substantially irrelevant. His suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that your very reasonable proposal should not be accepted, because someone has suggested in the House that the judge might be called before a committee of the House, is surely no reason why the Minister of Justice and the members on the other side of the House could not have accepted it. It is for the committee to decide how they would proceed, and I am sure a committee of this House would be quite capable of making that decision in a way consistent with the traditions of this House and of this country. For the Minister of Justice to make such a spurious argument and use that as a basis for refusing his consent, does not engender very much respect from me at least.

The minister also had something to say about his accountability to the House with respect to the conduct of trials and possible miscarriages of justice. I wonder why he introduced that at all, unless it was to infer that the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) ought to have proceeded in some other way. We all know that there is no way in which the Minister of Justice can be held accountable in any specific way to an appropriate committee, or any other way, because he does not have to answer questions even in committee.

The point the minister was trying to make, whatever it was, had nothing to do with the case. The distance the hon. gentleman has gone to try to suggest that we on this side of the House are thin-skinned to have taken offence at the remarks of the chief justice is a surprise to me. I asked myself as I listened to them: why are they taking this position? Why is the Minister of Justice and his parliamentary secretary taking this position? Surely, the whole purpose of this statement by the chief justice was to cause the hon. member for Peace River to desist in this kind of comment in this House. I suggest, with respect, that there is no other possible interpretation.

You, sir, may be quite right in suggesting that the hon. member for Peace River is not in fact intimidated, but I suggest to you that that is not a relevant consideration. I

*Privilege—Mr. Baldwin*

suggest the question is, what was this comment calculated to do? The only reason it was made by the chief judge was to cause the hon. member for Peace River and other members of parliament to desist from this kind of remark in the House.

As for the comments of the parliamentary secretary, there is some kind of conflict of privilege here that is a bit beyond me. I do not understand why both sides of the House could not have co-operated in getting this matter before a committee for consideration by an all-party standing committee. That would be the place to consider it, but that does not seem to be acceptable to the government, and I, therefore, suspect that you will have to make the decision, sir.

Without repeating myself unnecessarily, there has been an attempt made by the chief justice of this court to silence a member of parliament.

**Mr. Young:** Nonsense!

**Mr. Stanfield:** What nonsense? It is open to no other reasonable interpretation. It may be, on the pretence that you have indicated in a preliminary way, that you may have difficulty finding that on the traditions and on the concept of privilege it does constitute a violation of our privileges, but I suggest with all sincerity there is no other reasonable interpretation of these comments. They were intended to silence a member of parliament, and the fact that they have not, and will not silence him, is irrelevant. I am very disturbed by the attitude taken by the Minister of Justice and his parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to draw your attention to the fact that we are now discussing a comment made in French by a judge from Quebec, and on the fact that we are discussing a translation. A moment ago, Your Honour took the precaution of referring us to the French version, that is the original version of the hon. judge's comment, and you made a distinction which, in my view, is quite right and timely, pointing out that the statement made by the judge has a clearly different meaning than it seems to have in the English translation.

I do not wish to argue at this moment, Mr. Speaker, on the merits of the question raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). My point is that, realizing we were discussing the translation of a statement made in French by a francophone judge, I tried to get and did obtain from the clerk of the House or his assistant the French original of the statement. Mr. Speaker, that copy is practically illegible. It is impossible for me, as I can show you, and it comes from you because I had photocopies made of it, as I said, it is impossible to read it, to all practical purposes and intents, in an intelligent way and to comment on it today. I presume that someone must have had a legible version since we are now discussing the English translation. But it certainly is not the document I now