

*Administration of Justice*

that if the powers of the Attorneys General and the Minister of Justice here in Ottawa can be imposed upon to recognize this need, a need which exists in other fields, then it is all to the good. The Government has moved in other such fields. The party of which I have the honour to be a member, when it was the Government, moved in these fields, and latterly there has been this direction taken with regard to pensions and, as I say, medicare is on the road.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. Member for Greenwood that the terms of the motion could be broadened in order to give the people of Canada a much better area of coverage in the field of legal assistance. I hasten to say again that I support his motion, but I hope the Government will take notice that the field to be covered is a great deal broader than that suggested.

The previous speaker mentioned indigent cases. I do not know in what area consultation will take place and I do not know how one would govern the legal profession. I am well aware there are quite a number of lawyers who would steer clear of a multitude of such cases. I do not suggest they should form the biggest part of their practices, but I certainly believe that some method of consultation, some open method of choice of legal assistance is required if legislation were to develop from the motion that is before us.

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has performed a most useful function in presenting this motion to the House and giving us the opportunity to express various points of view on the very important subject matter of the motion. I must say if there is still anyone in the country who considers himself a traditional Conservative—small "c" or large "C", I suppose there may be some similarity—or Tory, or whatever term you want to apply to that class of person, he would probably have listened with a great deal of consternation to the suggestion made just now by the Conservative Party Whip, not because what he suggested would not be accepted on its merits by the public generally, but because a traditional right-wing Tory of the old school would find the suggestion far from his concept, as I understand it, of individual rights and so on.

**Mr. Winkler:** Would the hon. Member accept a question?

**Mr. Gray:** Yes.

**Mr. Winkler:** I would like to ask the hon. Member, on the consultation of civic groups, if he does not think my request or suggestion would be a most acceptable one across the country?

**Mr. Gray:** I think that the whole question of providing adequate legal services for all citizens is as useful a topic for consideration as is the question of providing adequate medical care and pensions.

**Mr. Winkler:** Let us not have the decision made by lawyers.

**Mr. Gray:** If my hon. friend is the type of fellow who wants to take out his own appendix, I suppose he can offer that type of opinion. I do not want to make a personal reference, but those in the profession know the saying that a person who is his own lawyer usually has a fool for a client. I do not intend this remark as a personal reference to my hon. friend.

**Mr. Winkler:** Use it yourself.

**Mr. Gray:** But I think that type of concept should be taken into account in giving proper recognition to the contributions that can be made to the professions in any sphere of activity where professionalism exists. I was not attempting to criticize my hon. friend for mentioning the type of suggestion he made. I began my remarks by saying his suggestion was quite a distance away from what many people understand to be the traditional Conservative right-wing view.

Having said that, I think he has also made a contribution to the discussion in suggesting, as I have just said in answer to his question, that there is a lot more can be looked at beyond the subject matter of this motion. However, I think the hon. Member for Greenwood attempted to remain within the rules governing the type of matter that can be considered in the House, and attempted to link his suggestion with something he felt would remain within the constitutional jurisdiction of the federal Government.

Perhaps under other circumstances he might have broadened his topic, and I do not think he should be criticized in any way for not taking into account the suggestion of the Tory Whip. However, it seems to me I should say that what the Tory Whip is suggesting is some form of legal care, if I may use that phrase. He spoke more or less of a scheme under which people would pay premiums and then get any type of legal service they would require, with the lawyer submit-