

*Oral Questions*

olds who currently smoke, 18,000 will be killed through the use of tobacco by the age of 70.

As a physician who has witnessed the tragedy and agony of smoking related illnesses and deaths, I want to commend our government for the progress made. We note with encouragement that the percentage of teenagers using tobacco dropped from 25 to 20 per cent last year. I am hopeful that the government's continuing efforts will result in a substantial drop in illness and deaths related to smoking.

Most of our government workers now enjoy a smoke-free environment, and what better gift can we give those within our own families than a smoke-free home environment. We applaud the many Canadians who have successfully kicked the habit and offer encouragement and support to those who are attempting to do so. The results are well worth the struggle.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, this government's support of the OSLO oil sands megaproject in northern Alberta is criticized, and rightly so, by those who take global warming seriously. Each barrel of oil thus produced will release four to five times as much carbon dioxide into the atmosphere as a barrel of conventional oil. The oil industry also criticizes the oil sands megaproject on economic grounds.

However the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources continues to defend the oil sands project which will cost taxpayers a fortune. He thinks it is necessary for energy security. He is wrong. Douglas Stoneman, senior vice-president of Shell Canada, told the energy committee that the OSLO oil sands project is not necessary for energy security. Mr. Stoneman added that subsidizing conventional technology for an uneconomic project is simply a burden to the taxpayers.

We say to the minister: "Don't aggravate the climate warming problem. Come to your senses at last and practise sustainable development."

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**THE JUDICIARY**

**Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. The independence of our judiciary has been fundamental to our parliamentary system since the Settlement Act of 1700.

That independence of judges was reconfirmed by two Acts of the Union Government of this country in 1843 and in 1867. Sections 96, 99 and 100 of the British North America Act, reconfirmed in 1982 by the Constitution Act, established completely the independence of judges in Canada. The rule is clear. Members of a government, members of the cabinet, cannot pick up the telephone and call a judge about a case that is being considered by that judge.

The Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport did just that. He has now confessed that yesterday he did indeed telephone Mr. Justice Macerola of the Quebec Superior Court about a case then under consideration by that judge just before the judge was due to render a judgment.

Has the Prime Minister, in these circumstances, asked for and has he received the resignation of the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport has been and continues to be a very honourable member of this House of Commons with a very substantial respect for its traditions. Because of his respect for that and his great regard for the independence of the judiciary he communicated with me and offered to submit his resignation, and I accepted it.

**Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I know that that weighs on the Prime Minister's mind, and I am satisfied with that particular response.

• (1420)

Earlier today two of his ministers, one being the minister of industry, said that the rule only applies to criminal cases and not civil cases, that there was no