

Mr. PIGEON: I have a last question to ask. (*Interpretation*): Do you believe that by adjourning we are showing that the committee is inferior and that it is losing its parliamentary rights?

Mr. MCGREGOR: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: No, it is not, because if the hon. member remembers different cases in the House of Commons, answers to questions have been refused owing to the fact that court cases were pending, or were on at the time the question was being asked—royal commissions were on, or something else of that nature. Therefore the questions could not be answered in the house.

Mr. PIGEON (*Interpretation*): What I want to point out here is that I do not want the Canadian people to have the impression that we have no right to watch over a point, a matter that is being studied by the courts.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that you will agree with me, Mr. Pigeon, that we have every right to check into everything possible, and you can rest assured that as soon as this trial is over we will again investigate the operation of the Jacques Cartier bridge. This matter is not closed. We would only be adjourning for the time being, to see how this case goes in Montreal; then we would open this committee again. We would sit again immediately it is over.

Mr. MCGREGOR: We have a list of witnesses who are supposed to be called. I cannot see what basis we can offer or what excuse we can give for not calling these witnesses, because these witnesses are certainly not going to be implicated in a court case.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a matter of being implicated in a court case.

Mr. MCGREGOR: Then what is it?

The CHAIRMAN: It is because of remarks made by members of this committee in regard to accused in Montreal. You received a letter from Mr. Ferland of Ottawa in regard to statements made by Mr. Grant Campbell a member of this committee.

Mr. MCPHILLIPS: Mr. Ferland is not from Ottawa; he is from Montreal. I think he has a lot of nerve to make remarks about what was said by a member of parliament in this committee. I think this whole thing has been brought about because of Mr. Ferland's letter, and I think it is absolute rot.

The CHAIRMAN: When this committee began its proceedings it was definitely understood that, if at all possible, we should keep away from these toll collectors, whether the present ones, or those accused, or those that were going to be arrested. We have tried to do so. But we have now found that it is almost impossible to do it. Therefore, I feel, as chairman of this committee, that this committee should adjourn at the present time.

Mr. ASSELIN: Could we not adjourn the committee until next week, and then ask the Minister of Justice to come before the committee to give us his advice.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I doubt if the Minister of Justice within a week could tell how the case was going in Montreal. We would have to have an adjournment of longer than a week.

Mr. MCPHILLIPS: That is what you say, Mr. Chairman. But the Minister of Justice has not indicated that it is because this preliminary inquiry is proceeding that we should stop. That is your view. You are putting it to the committee. I do not agree with you at all. I think it is only proper ethics that we should ask the minister again, because he is the one who told us that we could go ahead.

Mr. HOWE: I would be quite willing to change my motion, that this matter be referred to the steering committee, and advice given to the committee by the Minister of Justice, on whether we should proceed any further or not at this time.