

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Martin, I believe if you look up the rules you will find that if a member of a committee feels that what a certain member is speaking about is not admissible, then he can make a motion that what he is speaking about cannot be read.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Yes, but I do not believe it is possible to do that. I have not even started to read this letter; I have not quoted one word from this letter. But what I am saying is that this letter is in the hands of every member of this committee—

Mr. DRYSDALE: He is sneaking in his argument, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Martin, what I am afraid of and have been trying to avoid—and I have tried to keep the members on a straight line—is getting into any argument or bringing up any questions or any answers that would have any dealing at all with the accused. I am just afraid, if you bring in this letter of the solicitor for the accused, that there is every possibility that you will overstep the line.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the caution and the care that you are taking in this matter.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I would still like to speak to the motion.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): May I address myself to the chair, and will my young, irrepressible friend take his seat?

Mr. DRYSDALE: I realize, on a point of privilege, that the Liberal party is against youth, and they have said so several times in the House—

The CHAIRMAN: No mention of parties, please.

Mr. DRYSDALE: He has referred to my youth, and I am elected like any other member of parliament, and I am entitled to take my seat and speak, just as much as he is. There was a motion put by Mr. Pigeon, and I stood up to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN: I have asked Mr. Martin not to read it.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): And I want to address myself to that.

Mr. DRYSDALE: How did he manage to hedge in ahead of me, Mr. Chairman, on this particular motion, when I stood up?

Mr. HORNER (*Acadia*): He never sat down.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Let us get that cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN: I think, in all fairness, Mr. Drysdale should be allowed to say something on this and then we can hear you after that, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): That is very fair, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DRYSDALE: That is the only point I was trying to make right from the start.

This letter has been circulated among all the members of the committee. We have seen it and, in my opinion, to read the letter at this particular time is likely to prejudice the hearing of the accused.

The only thing I want to refer to, in what Mr. Martin has been discussing, is a very excellent editorial in the *Montreal Star*, which Mr. Martin heartily endorsed this morning, and that is the editorial of Monday, May 2.

The reason I refer to this particular editorial is that there are certain statements in there that have been in the newspapers concerning this particular hearing.

The editorial is headed:

The Bridge Probe and the Courts.

I will not read it all, Mr. Chairman, but it says:

The committee is concerned lest its hearings cut across the court cases and prejudice the trial of criminal charges. This is a wholly laudable purpose. No one would wish to see the trials prejudiced by