

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 10, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

PROPOSAL THAT MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS MAKE A STATEMENT OUTLINING HIS CONVERSATION WITH JUDGE HUGESSEN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Considering the fundamental importance of the right of the people of Canada to be certain that the executive branch of our government does not interfere with the judicial branch; considering also that the Prime Minister has asserted that the government will take no further action on the alleged impropriety in this respect on the part of some of his ministers unless a specific grievance is made by the Chief Justice of the Superior Court; and following the report made last night that the Minister of Public Works specifically attempted to ascertain the conditions of a judicial settlement on behalf of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet), I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House urges the Minister of Public Works to make a statement in the House outlining the exact nature of his conversation with Judge Hugessen, so that members of the House and the public will have the opportunity of judging, independent of the opinion of the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec, whether or not the Minister violated his obligations as a minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HEALTH

SUGGESTED CONSTRUCTION OF TUNNEL TO CONFEDERATION BUILDING TO PERMIT MEMBERS TO JOG AND IMPROVE FITNESS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that the minister of health has just introduced the fit kit, and in view of the fact that the government is spending several thousands of dollars annually on bus transportation, gaso-

line and oil, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds):

That the government give immediate consideration to the construction of a tunnel connecting the Confederation Building to the existing West Block tunnel so that the minister of health can jog along with Mitch and members and staff of Confederation in order to save fuel and tax dollars and improve his fitness and our physical fitness.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER OUTLINE PROPOSAL TO BRING CONSTITUTION TO CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to present a motion under Standing Order 43 regarding a matter of urgent importance. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House urges the Prime Minister, at the earliest opportunity, to make a speech or a statement in the House of Commons, outlining clearly the precise steps he has in mind in connection with his proposal to bring the British North America Act to Canada and under Canadian control.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ALLEGATIONS OF INTERFERENCE BY JUDGE MACKAY—INQUIRY AS TO CONTENT OF CONVERSATION OF MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS WITH JUDGE HUGESSEN

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Last Wednesday, as reported at page 11457 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Public Works said that, along with other persons, he had contacted the Associate Chief Justice of Quebec to "effect a solution to" the appeal of court proceedings. In trying to find a solution, did the minister, as was alleged last night, try to sound out the presiding judge as to how the court would respond to an apology by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?