

Inquiries of the Ministry

tion form or whatever you call it, with the coat of arms removed? If there has not been any such request, all the Minister has to say is no, but his evasiveness indicates a basis for my question.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have not been evasive. I stated in my reply previously that discussions have been held with respect to designs.

Some hon. Members: Oh, Oh.

Mr. MacEachen: I make no apology for that. But what I do say as my firm answer is that no decision has been taken to change the present format of the card, and if any decision is taken it will be announced to my hon. friends.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why have the discussions taken place regarding removal of the coat of arms? Is there something wrong with the coat of arms? Does it not meet with the approval of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are entering into a debate of the question.

PRIVILEGE

MR. TURNER—ALLEGED RECEIPT OF
CAMPAIGN FUNDS FROM HAL
BANKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John N. Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I have just had handed to me an article which appears in the first edition of the *Toronto Telegram* alleging that I, among three other gentlemen, received campaign funds from deposed Seafarers' International Union boss Hal Banks.

I want to say before the House and my colleagues that I deny that statement categorically and completely. I also understand that in a later edition of the *Toronto Telegram* a specific amount is alleged. This allegation is based on the transcript of an interview, apparently, between the hon. Member for Yukon and certain members of the S.I.U. I have neither read nor seen the transcript, but when I heard the news this morning I discussed the allegations with my campaign manager. He has discussed the allegations with my fiscal agent under the Elections Act, and I am advised that my campaign received no financial contribution or financial assistance whatsoever, either during the 1962 or during the 1963 campaign, either from the S.I.U. or from any officer of that union.

I can say that I personally received no contribution during either of those election campaigns either from the S.I.U. or from any officer of the union, so I repeat that I deny completely and categorically any allegations to the contrary. I reserve my right in this Chamber, when I have had an opportunity of reading the transcript—when I find where it is being circulated—and have had an opportunity of reading the later edition of the *Toronto Telegram*, to make whatever further statement, or to take whatever further action, I may deem necessary.

There is just one further matter I should like to mention with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and it is this. The part of the transcript pertinent to me concerns a conversation between one Mr. John Dormer, who was the editor of the *Canadian Sailor*, and the hon. Member for Yukon. Upon questioning by the hon. Member for Yukon Mr. John Dormer said that he could not prove his allegations but was depending for their substance upon what Mr. Hal C. Banks had told him. So we are dealing, Mr. Speaker, in the area of hearsay, and I need not remind the Members of this House how Mr. Justice Norris characterized Mr. Banks in terms of being a truthful and forthright witness.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What did the Commissioner say about the present president?

Mr. McIlraith: What about the hon. Member for Yukon?

Mr. Turner: I should like to read to the House from page 249 of the Norris report:

He is a bully, cruel, dishonest, greedy, power hungry, contemptuous of the law. In his mouth, the use of the word "democracy" is sheer blasphemy. For him the "big lie" and the failure to remember are ever-ready weapons and shields.

I should also like to refer to that part of the report which deals with what Mr. Justice Norris said about the *Canadian Sailor*, as reported at page 128:

The issues of the *Canadian Sailor* filed with the Commission show that it is a dishonest propaganda sheet. On the one hand it directs invective and abuse against those who may differ with Banks—

—as I differed with Banks publicly in this Chamber when the trustees act was brought before the House—

—against other trade unions, and against constituted authority.

Then at page 129 the following appears:

Themes are repeated tirelessly—the technique for the "big lie" is practised unendingly. Distortions of the truth seem unrestricted.