to provoke their intervention without there being any question of excess of jurisdiction.

In the case of Ridge v. Baldwin in 1964, the House of Lords held that the decision of the Watch Committee of the Town of Brighton to dismiss the chief of police and so deprive him of the right to a pension was null *ab initio* because he was not given an opportunity to be heard. In this case, the highest judicial authority in England formally declared that the violation of the rule of natural justice is a separate and independent criterion which the courts may use as the basis for review of the legality of administrative acts or decisions of a judicial or quasi judicial character.

The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) says, if I understand him correctly, that we in this country have labour boards from whose decisions there is no provision for appeal. Mr. Speaker, there are statutes so numerous that it would take me all night to enumerate them, which do give the right to appeal. Let us consider the famous case of Calgary Power v. Copithorne in 1959. Calgary Power had expropriated a certain amount of land, and there was no right of appeal provided. The courts held that because the terms of the statute had been exceeded the decision could nevertheless, be appealed. But what ordinary citizen can afford the luxury of justice in such cases? Let me show hon. members how much justice can cost. Eighteen men stand charged in Calgary for bookmaking. The preliminary hearing lasted ten days—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much.

If each of the accused is represented by a lawyer, what does it cost to get to trial? The evidence in the preliminary hearing costs $2,000, so, those court reporters want $2,000 from each of the 18 accused. So, it would cost at least $36,000 to get into a court of justice in this country. The point I am making is this: where one has to rely on special, prerogative rights and remedies, the situation becomes both expensive and complex, requiring highly skilled and efficient lawyers. I say to the Minister of Justice and to the Secretary of State that what we need is a simple right to appeal, so that when a report or decision is made which adversely affects any individual, whether French speaking or English speaking, such a person, if he feels aggrieved, may have his case reviewed by a judge. If he has been wrongfully dismissed, he could be reinstated by that same judge. Then, whether he is a scientist, or an economist, or a medical specialist, Canada will not be denied the benefit of his skills, and we can move toward the affluent society to which we all look forward on the basis of the resources available to us. We can learn to compete in world markets with our wheat, our oil, and our industrial products.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

• (5:20 p.m.)

I end with these words. I hope the Minister of Justice is not going to say that this is only an administrative decision. I do not care whether the decision is made by a board, a court or an individual; if that decision carries the weight of a judgment that affects the human rights of Canadians, particularly the right of a Canadian to make a living, then the person concerned should be heard. The door should be open to him. No decision should be made in camera. He must have the right to counsel, and he must have the right to the best counsel available.

If this government denies these privileges to Canadian citizens, it is doing them the gravest injustice. The principle of the bill, I endorse. The principle itself is good. Why destroy this great principle by denying Canadian citizens the right to be heard in the way I have suggested? I warn Canadians, and particularly French Canadians, that without this right of appeal it is they who stand to lose.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) but I must say that his speech this afternoon was a rerun in colour of a speech he made on an earlier occasion in this house with regard to an earlier amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) which related to clauses 28, 29 and 30 of this bill. My remarks will be brief because I should like to refer Your Honour and other hon. members to the reply that I made on a rather enthusiastic evening to the hon. member for Calgary North, to be found on page 10363 of *Hansard* for June 18, and which dealt in substance with the powers of the official languages commissioner, the