

● (2210)

Let me say this, Madam Speaker: these transcripts of evidence, eight volumes, only became available in part to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Toronto a few days ago from the Crown prosecutor and they are not yet available to the force in Ottawa. Since that time I have consulted with the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police about them, and he read to me by telephone those parts where the names of certain political figures were mentioned. I could request the entire transcript and read it once it becomes available, but that will depend on the circumstances. In cases where members of parliament, ministers or senior civil servants seem to be implicated in a criminal or subversive matter then, of course, I would read the evidence in greater detail and report it to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). However, I would not at that stage of the proceedings make my findings, conversations or advice public.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. minister, but the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** If it would be permissible, Madam Speaker, we would be glad to hear the minister's answer further.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** This can only be done by unanimous consent. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Allmand:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank hon. members of the opposition. This is a serious matter. I will take only another minute.

The hon. member for Central Nova has asked me to tell the House that no member of parliament or minister is implicated in the Hamilton Harbour case as a result of the preliminary inquiry transcripts. I can say that, at this time, there is no evidence to lay further criminal charges against anyone. I will not say more about the transcripts because I think to do so would be contrary to our general principles of justice and, in particular, to the principles in Section 467.

In the Hamilton Harbour case a thorough criminal investigation has been carried out by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Criminal charges have been laid against five persons. Three have been found guilty, two are going to trial and a further investigation is still possible.

Furthermore, the assessment of evidence and the decision on prosecution are under the attorney general for Ontario and his crown prosecutors. Thus far they have deemed it proper to charge only five persons. If there are to be further criminal charges and prosecutions, then that will be their decision with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, not mine.

In any case, I am quite prepared to let justice take its natural course and will not, at this stage, do anything which might be prejudicial to innocent persons or contrary to the principles of our criminal law.

### *Adjournment Debate*

#### HARBOURS—HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSION—DOCUMENT SERVED ON MINISTER OF LABOUR TO AUTHORIZE SEARCH OF OFFICE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Madam Speaker, in my position as the chairman of my party's justice caucus, I asked certain questions today of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro). I would say at the outset that in addition to being responsible for labour this minister, as does every minister of the Crown, has certain other responsibilities. He has responsibility as a member of the House and responsibility in his position as Minister of Labour.

If there should be any suggestion that there is any inpropriety, it is up to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) to make certain observations and carry out certain research work.

I just want to review the questions I put today. I put them as gently as anybody could. At that time I asked, "Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Labour whether he was served with any documentation at the time the RCMP allegedly had authority to search his office? Was the minister served with an affidavit or any other documentation which led to the authority for his office being searched sometime during the election?"

As I understand it, the RCMP entered his office in Hamilton during the election.

The minister answered in this way, "Mr. Speaker, the RCMP did come to my office. They had a document, but it did not pertain to my particular office. In any event, I gave them access to what they wanted."

We have no information as to what they asked for or why they were there.

Then I asked a further question, "Has the minister seen any documents which gave the RCMP authority to search his office and take certain files or whatever else they did at that time? Has the minister read any documentation which the RCMP had or which was filed in the court house to give the RCMP that authority?"

The minister replied, "Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything was filed in the court house because the documentation was not applicable to my particular headquarters. I just saw what they had. They agreed it was not applicable."

The question I want to put to the minister now is this—I will come to the procedure under the Code in a moment or two—is the reason that the documents were not filed in the court house because the minister said they did not pertain to his office?

I then asked the minister, "Do I take it that no search was made of the minister's office because the authority they had did not pertain to the office of the Minister of Labour or any material or documentation the minister may have had? Also, did the minister read what the RCMP had in their hands which gave them some authority, either in his office or that of someone else?"

Then there was this very unusual answer, "Mr. Speaker, they wanted permission to look at documents in my office, the contents of which I was really not aware. They were in cabinets. I gave them permission to go ahead—"