

*Oral Questions*

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lang:** Rather than terminate these discussions abruptly and reaching a decision before we have been able to consider all the circumstances, we have decided to tolerate some modest postponements while we are looking at the question of whether the objective is sound and is generally accepted, that is, imposing user fees and obtaining money from those who have the advantage rather than from the general taxpayer. While that objective is being agreed upon, we are looking at alternative ways of collection so that we can minimize administration problems.

**Mr. Oberle:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the House if he will use this interim period to discuss with his officials and people who are interested in flying—apart from the Liberal caucus—whether it would be advisable to establish a system that would apply to people living closer to the metropolitan areas and larger international airports and not those living in remote and frontier areas of our country? Would the minister also tell the House whether it is the intention to establish a system by which the Department of Transport airplanes will pay to land at air strips not under its jurisdiction?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, we are trying to look at all the circumstances in determining the best means of collection. I can assure the hon. member that I always get the best arguments from the Liberal caucus.

\* \* \*

#### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

KNOWLEDGE OF PRIME MINISTER OF REQUEST OF MR. DRURY  
BY MR. OUELLET FOR INTERVENTION WITH JUDGE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. On Wednesday, March 17, the Prime Minister told the House that he did not learn about the request for an intervention until Monday, March 15. The Prime Minister stated, as recorded at page 11866 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ouellet told me about that precise request he made to the minister on Monday of this week.

Is the Prime Minister telling this House that he did not at any point before March 15 ask the Minister of Public Works if the former minister for consumer and corporate affairs had made a "precise request" for an intervention on his behalf?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question.

INQUIRY WHETHER PRIME MINISTER REPORTED ALLEGED  
INTERFERENCE WITH JUDICIARY TO QUEBEC ATTORNEY  
GENERAL

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for the Prime Minister. I am sure this one has not been put to him. In light of the fact that the Minister of Public Works said at the begin-

[Mr. Lang.]

ning of this situation on March 3, as reported at page 11457 of *Hansard*:

Indeed, the only intervention that would be contemplated by me would be one to see that he—

Meaning the judge.

—was in full knowledge of the facts and did his duty.

In light of the fact that the government seems to be supersensitive to the words "improper", "wrongful" or "illegality", may I ask if the Prime Minister would advise the House whether he has reported the facts told to us by the government, unknown to us, known to them, to the attorney general of Quebec to determine whether there was an offence.

**An hon. Member:** Go back to school.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, may I put that question again.

**Mr. Paproski:** A little slower.

**Mr. Woolliams:** May I ask the minister if he has reported to the attorney general of Quebec the matters told to him by the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs and the admission I just read with reference to the Minister of Public Works?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is related to the preamble of the question about us being sensitive to words like "illegality" or "impropriety". The answer is we have admitted—the minister has admitted some impropriety and has apologized for it. Illegality is something else again. If there is illegality or we have cause to believe there is illegality or hon. members opposite have cause to believe there is illegality, first of all the hon. member for York-Simcoe would not have withdrawn his statement if he had some evidence of it. He does not seem to have any evidence of it and we do not have any evidence of it. If we had we would, of course, turn it over to the attorney general of the province who would be entitled to prosecute.

\* \* \*

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PREMIER OF PRINCE EDWARD  
ISLAND, HONOURABLE ALEX CAMPBELL

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before recognizing another questioner may I call the attention to the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished visitor, the premier of the very important province of Prince Edward Island, the Honourable Alex Campbell.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!