

The more my hon. friend talks, the more convinced I am that he does not fully understand the most elementary proceedings of legal practice; and if what my hon. friend from Victoria said is to be considered seriously, and I think it deserves to be, then these are proceedings *ab initio* in the magistrate's court, in which all that the magistrate has to do is to determine only whether or not there is a *prima facie* case; and if there has not been offered in this committee all kinds of observations which certainly would—would certainly—establish a *prima facie* offence, then I certainly do not understand the meaning of that kind of evidence.

Mr. JOHNSON: That may be the point.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): But that is not what I am complaining about. Mr. Campbell asked me to refer to the evidence at page 172.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I wonder if it is proper for Mr. Martin to go back and review the evidence and to indicate statements which were made?

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Well, he asked for it.

Mr. DRYSDALE: What we are trying to decide at the present time is whether or not this committee will ignore statements perhaps that might be on the borderline, since the matter is sub judice, and we are trying to ascertain at the present time whether or not this committee should go forward and examine the administration of toll collection, and matters which are sub judice.

What you are doing is to say on the one hand: let us have a fair hearing, while on the other hand you are trying to quote statements which in your opinion might be sub judice.

I do not think it is appropriate or relevant at this time to go back over the evidence and to reargue it. I am quite prepared to admit that there may be statements which are not completely correct.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): You have made your point. It is not a point of order at all; it is an argument.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I used exactly the same type of statement that you made.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Now that you have made it, I suggest whether or not my argument is sound that I have the right to point out that these proceedings that cover the whole matter are of such a character as to raise possible doubts as to the character of the proceedings outside of this chamber in the criminal courts.

That is the argument that I am making; and the rules in Beauchesne and Erskine to which I shall make reference later on clearly indicate that we are seized in a judicial proceeding pending, only if it be in the matter of a bill before the house. Then the house is not seized, nor is a committee of the house properly seized with jurisdiction in the matter. What I was doing was to relay a specific request from the hon. member for Cornwall. He asked me to be precise.

Mr. DRYSDALE: That was the reason I raised the point. Because the hon. member asked you to read something does not mean that it is necessarily correct.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*):

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): I am laying the foundation for the questions which were relevant this morning. I notice that there is a consistent correlation between the increase in revenue and the increase in vehicle registrations. The graph line is quite consistent throughout. There are no violent fluctuations. That indicates one of two conclusions. The first conclusion is that everything was completely in order, that there was no malfeasance of any kind, and that all the revenue possible to be obtained was being obtained.