

Mr. JOHNSON: Do you actually know that the court proceedings are being held before a judge alone, without a jury?

Dr. OLLIVIER: Well, I think it would influence a judge less than it would influence a jury, if that is what you mean.

But there is another point. You have not mentioned anybody in particular—well, perhaps, once or twice—but to my mind that does not change the situation very much.

Supposing out of six accused there was one who was completely innocent. He would be found guilty by implication or association, just by the very fact you do not mention names.

Mr. DRYSDALE: How do you justify that conclusion? Mr. Chairman, I think Dr. Ollivier put the matter very clearly when he said that this question of *sub judice* dealt with the matter under adjudication. I think that, very simply, the matter under adjudication is the case of six toll collectors who have been charged with theft. I think that is the area we must stay clear of, and Dr. Ollivier has given what he said was his opinion.

As Mr. Johnson has pointed out, there are no references in the proceedings so far to indicate that we have infringed on what is going on in Montreal, and I suggest, having heard Dr. Ollivier's opinion, that it is now up to the committee to decide whether or not we should proceed. I feel that under your very capable chairmanship we can get on to matters that are dealing purely with administration.

We have a large selection of witnesses to choose from, and I cannot see that there is any danger of infringing on those particular matters. I do not think it has been done, despite the allegations of this lawyer from Montreal, and I do not see that it will arise. I feel, and I have every confidence, that we can proceed in that direction, Mr. Chairman, and accordingly I would move that the committee proceed with the—

The CHAIRMAN: We have a motion to that effect before the committee.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I will second Mr. Pigeon's motion.

Mr. PIGEON: Mr. Chairman, I have a remark to make. All newspapers in the country wrote an article—newspaper men—on the situation we have in Montreal on the Jacques Cartier bridge, and I remember—pardon me if I continue in French—I remember the newspaper, *La Presse*—(*Interpretation*) I remember a caricature in *La Presse*, for instance, a drawing in which we read the *Dance of the Millions*. I would like to have an opinion from Dr. Ollivier here as to what he thinks of what was written in the newspapers in articles, speculations, and so on, throughout the country.

Dr. OLLIVIER: I do not believe that I should be asked to answer that question, because I think your opinion is just as good as mine is on that. Of course, I think it applies also to newspapers, that they should not prejudice cases. If the accused has a complaint to make about a newspaper, it is up to him to sue the newspaper, if he thinks that newspaper has prejudiced his case. Newspapers have not the right to prejudice a case either.

Mr. PIGEON: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion to place before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you have placed the motion, and it has been seconded. Mr. Martin is speaking on the motion, I imagine—and then Mr. McPhillips.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Mr. Chairman, you will recall that at the last meeting I pointed out to the committee that one of the solicitors in this matter had, in a letter which was published in *Le Devoir* of that day, taken objection to the simultaneous proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: That was a week and a half, or so, ago.