

Administration of Justice

[Translation]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICEREQUEST FOR INQUIRY ON ALLEGED INTERVENTION OF
MINISTERS WITH QUEBEC JUDGES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion concerning an important question.

Taking into account the revelations made by special attorney Richard Holden concerning the intervention by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) in judicial proceedings, and the inexcusable leaks which happened at Mr. Holden's office to the profit of the media, particularly the *Globe and Mail*, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House order the federal government to request a special inquiry by an independent group on the whole question of intervention by members of the cabinet with different judges in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore, the motion cannot be put.

[English]

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS
THAT MINISTERS INTERFERED WITH JUDICIARY—MOTION
UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Since the Prime Minister has declined to give the House and the country any assurances that the conduct of his ministers vis-à-vis the judiciary will be subjected to the scrutiny of a public inquiry, and since his predecessor, the late Lester B. Pearson, at the time of the Dorion inquiry, clearly outlined by letter to his ministers that there must be no attitudes of mind or standards of conduct which could effect the full confidence of the people in the proper conduct of public affairs, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That this House reject the Prime Minister's unilateral imposition of his own personal standards of what is right and proper in terms of his ministers' behaviour, and calls upon him to make public all of the evidence upon which he has come to such a conclusion and to institute a full public inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43 unanimous consent is required. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO BAR ASSOCIATIONS OF
APPROACHES TO JUDGES BY MINISTERS WHO ARE LAWYERS—
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of allegations against certain cabinet ministers who are also lawyers that they have intervened with members of the judiciary with respect to matters before the court, and in view of the statement in the code of professional conduct of the Canadian Bar Association that a lawyer must not "endeavour or allow anyone else to endeavour, directly or indirectly, to influence the decision or action of a tribunal or any of its officials in any case or matter, whether by bribery, personal approach or any means other than open persuasion as an advocate", and in view of the fact that there have been admissions of personal approaches to members of the judiciary by certain cabinet ministers who are also lawyers, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence):

That this House direct the Minister of Justice and the chief law officer of the Crown to refer the matter of the personal approaches made to members of the judiciary by cabinet ministers who are also lawyers to the respective law societies of which the said cabinet ministers are members for investigation or appropriate disciplinary action.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can only be presented with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICEALLEGATIONS OF INTERFERENCE BY JUDGE MACKAY—PRIME
MINISTER'S KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENTS OF CONVERSATIONS
BETWEEN MR. DRURY AND JUDGE HUGESSEN

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister who, naturally, must take responsibility for the conduct of his ministers and answer to Parliament for the ethics of his government. Would the right hon. gentleman tell us whether, in his explanation to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Public Works completely denied the allegation that he had tried to effect a solution in the court case by seeking an indication from the judge as to how the judge would respond to an apology from the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I would say, because it is relevant to my statement that the minister in my view was not guilty of any attempt to influence the court, that effectively the minister did deny that he in any way attempted to influence the court. Beyond that, I repeat what I have said to the House on previous occasions. The relevant subject is, surely, whether the courts were interfered with and not what ministers said to each other. I hear the hon. lady over there snorting.