

*Federal-Provincial Relations*

That the House regret and strongly condemn the crusade undertaken by the Green Peace Corps which, through illegal means, seeks to deprive indirectly the fishermen of eastern Canada, and particularly those of the Atlantic region and of Magdalen Islands in Quebec, of part of their income derived at this time of year from seal hunting, and that the government enforce with all due strictness the regulations enacted and promulgated concerning that kind of hunt.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

● (1410)

[*English*]

**Mr. Leggatt:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. An indication was given by Your Honour that this motion was agreed to unanimously. Am I correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Unanimous consent pursuant to Standing Order 43 refers only to the presentation of the motion. I had asked whether there was unanimous consent that the motion be presented pursuant to Standing Order 43, and it was my impression that there was no disagreement with that; therefore, I presented the motion. However, if in the commotion that usually surrounds such motions I overlooked any hon. member who either now identifies himself or who distinctly heard another hon. member withhold his unanimous consent, I stand to be corrected and the motion ought not to have been put.

**Mr. Leggatt:** The motion ought not to have been put, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Evidently the hon. member makes it clear that the unanimous consent of the House was not forthcoming, and therefore that motion ought not to have been put.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS**

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER APOLOGIZE FOR BEHAVIOUR IN RECENT VISIT TO QUEBEC—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I should like to present a motion.

As the federal government exists owing to the express will of the provinces, and as each one of them wants to keep its identity and integrity, and as the contempt and demagoguery expressed by the Prime Minister over the weekend toward Mr. Robert Bourassa were a direct attack on the Quebec premier and an indirect one on all provincial premiers, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That the House request the Prime Minister of Canada to make a public apology in order to prevent that regrettable incident from having untoward consequences.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the motion cannot be put without unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[*English*]

**ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**

ALLEGATIONS OF INTERFERENCE BY JUDGE MACKAY—BASIS ON WHICH CONSUMER MINISTER ASKED MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO APPROACH JUDGE HUGESSEN

**Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works who must realize that his answers in this House last Wednesday, as reported on page 11457 of *Hansard*, have put him in an extremely difficult position as a member of the House and as a senior member of the government. Yesterday the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs refused to answer questions about conversations between himself and the Minister of Public Works. Would the Minister of Public Works now tell this House on what basis the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs asked him to approach Mr. Justice Hugessen?

**Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I support entirely and follow in the footsteps of my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I am somewhat surprised that the hon. gentleman does not accept that conversations between members of the privy council are privileged.

ALLEGATIONS OF INTERFERENCE BY JUDGE MACKAY—PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION ON REFUSAL OF MINISTERS TO ANSWER

**Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that the ministers get together on their excuses. The Minister of Public Works is claiming privilege. Yesterday the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs was claiming that the reason for his not answering was that the matter was before the courts, I suggest a spurious reason. May I ask the Prime Minister whether he accepts either or both of these dodges as a means of keeping from the House of Commons information that the House of Commons should know about the potential involvement by intervention by ministers of the Crown in decisions of members of the judiciary respecting matters that are before the courts. Does the Prime Minister accept the reasons which have been given for refusing to answer questions by either the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I answered this question in great detail last week, when I answered many, many questions. I could rehearse the answer once more, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to hear it. I have heard from the three ministers who were mentioned in Justice Mackay's letter. I consulted myself,