

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**An hon. Member:** She does that all the time.

**An hon. Member:** That is one of her better speeches. She was at her most eloquent.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Therefore, I would urge the opposition to get back to the main question of the relationship between the ministers and the judges and not the relationship between ministers.

**Mr. Clark:** On behalf of the House I must, I suppose, congratulate the Prime Minister on his extraordinary range—

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

**Mr. Hees:** Wait till you hear it.

**Mr. Clark:**—his extraordinary range of evasion. He does not miss a chance or a snort.

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

**Mr. Clark:** The Prime Minister of course once again did not answer the specific question as to whether or not there was a denial by the Minister of Public Works of an attempt to seek from the judge an indication of how the judge would respond to an apology. Since raising with the judge any suggestion of the political impact of a verdict and any suggestion of the regard in which an accused is held by the government could certainly constitute both an attempt to influence and intimidate, I would like to ask the Prime Minister—and I wish he would be specific in his response—whether the Minister of Public Works has categorically denied to the Prime Minister that he reminded the judge that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is an important person and that the verdict is an extremely sensible and potentially explosive matter? Has the Minister of Public Works explicitly denied that he made that kind of representation to the judge in this case?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, Mr. Speaker, nor did he specifically deny that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is about five feet ten inches and has brown hair.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Clark:** It would of course be easier for us all if the Prime Minister would simply come clean with the House of Commons—

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

**Mr. Clark:**—and tell us what the minister did say to the judge so that we and not he, the interested party, can come to some conclusion as to whether or not there was an attempt to act in an improper way. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that he has asked the chief justice:

... to give us information that might be in his possession respecting any unwarranted attempts to interfere with proper administration.

I wonder if the Prime Minister would spell out for this House the circumstances in which he believes it would be warranted for a minister of the Crown to attempt to

#### *Oral Questions*

influence the decision of a judge in a case then before the courts.

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

#### PRIME MINISTER'S CONVERSATION WITH CONSUMER MINISTER CONCERNING APPROACH TO JUDGE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question. The Prime Minister has said that he received private explanations from the three ministers who reported—

**Mr. Trudeau:** I cannot hear you with all the noise.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I am sorry the Prime Minister cannot hear me. The Prime Minister said he received private explanations from the three ministers who were reported to have approached the judge. Without accepting in any way that that constitutes an adequate response in terms of the Prime Minister's duty to parliament, I would like to ask him whether he has had a similar conversation with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who has been found guilty of contempt in court, who allegedly requested one reported intervention.

● (1420)

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I told the House that I spoke to all three ministers, that they gave me the substance of what they had said to the particular judge, and that I had reached the conclusion they were not attempting to influence the outcome of the case. I can understand the House wanting to pursue that knowledge, but I suggest the proper course would be to pursue it with the courts themselves, who are surely the best judges of whether they have been influenced. If they say they were, obviously we might have to follow a course which would be announced. However, this is the whole purport of the letter of the Minister of Justice to the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec.

#### CONTENT OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. DRURY AND JUDGE HUGESSEN CONCERNING CONSUMERS MINISTER

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Yesterday the Prime Minister stated that unilaterally he had made a decision that there was no intervention, and he said any attempt made would be wrong. Then he said, and I quote:

The essence of the question is "Did you talk to the judge in order to influence the judgment or to influence the course of justice"? That is the relevant—

If that is a relevant question, is the Prime Minister now prepared to give a relevant answer that the ministers made to him, referring to the Minister of Public Works and others talking to the judges, and what the Minister of Public Works said to the associate chief justice as to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs? In other words, if the question is relevant, let us have relevant answers.

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

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I agree completely with the hon. member for Calgary North. The