

S. O. 52

was a second point the right hon. gentleman wanted to raise, and I would like to hear him on that.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): The convention of *sub judice* is not meant to hamstring this House from debating the real issues now before you, Mr. Speaker. In 1977 a special committee, to which you referred in your earlier judgment in this House on *sub judice*, had the following to say as regards your role in the application of the *sub judice* convention. I want to quote from that committee:

In exercising this discretion, your Committee recommends that when there is a doubt in the mind of the Chair, a presumption shall exist in favour of allowing debate and against the application of the convention.

Those were the words of the committee which you, Mr. Speaker, recited with some approval in your recent judgment.

The current trial may go on for a considerable length of time. The people of Canada cannot wait. Canadians have a right to know whether or not our system of justice has been tampered with and thereby undermined. The information on the public record so far in the trial indicates political interference. Canadians therefore have a right to know. Canadians want an assurance that the administration of justice is fair and impartial. I would think that the government would want this issue cleared up quickly as well.

[*Translation*]

So the issue we want to raise with you, Mr. Speaker, is the possibility that some people may have interfered politically in this affair, continually and over many years.

This matter is very important and requires our consideration as soon as possible here in the House.

So I respectfully suggest, within the limits you set for me, Mr. Speaker, that you suspend the business of the House to allow us to discuss this matter in depth.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a similar motion which I brought to your attention on the same subject. I would like to say at the outset, notwithstanding the importance of the issue, that it did seem to me that the rules require us to stay within one or

two sentences. If we were going to raise a question of privilege it would enable us to deal with this very serious matter at greater length.

I want to come right to the point. As I said in my letter to you, my intention is to move for the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 52 for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent and pressing concern, namely, in this case, the fact that during the criminal proceedings involving Messrs. Belisle, Appleby and Small, a serious allegation has been made, namely, that political considerations played a role in the laying of charges against individuals. It is of fundamental importance that this be clarified and clarified soon.

Your Honour, on November 7 you did rule on this subject at that time and said that the *sub judice* convention, and I cite your words, "should apply in this case", and then significantly you added the words, "for the time being".

My reason for raising it today is that since November 7 at which time I think it is reasonable to conclude that most if not all observers thought that the situation would be resolved within a matter of days then and that there would be a judgment by the judge on the issue enabling us to deal with it in the House. Since then, as Your Honour knows, the proceedings have been delayed and they will not get back to the court level of discussion until December 18. This I stress, Your Honour, has happened since you gave us your original ruling and I submit to you that the question as to whether or not there are political considerations taking place in the laying of criminal charges is too important a matter for us to allow another delay to take place, this time for another month. Therefore, I ask Your Honour to reach the conclusion that the public interest at this time should come down on the side of having a public hearing in this Chamber on that profoundly important question.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened to the observations of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Member for Oshawa. In view of the issue I have probably been very lenient indeed in allowing both the hon. members to make their point. I want to assure them both that I have their point and I will consider their observations and report back to the House as soon as it is appropriate.