public the proceedings at a preliminary inquiry, and I intend to respect that provision of the law.

* * *

## ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

AUTHORITY TO SEARCH HAMILTON OFFICE OF MINISTER OF LABOUR—SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** My question is also directed to the Solicitor General. Has he looked into the possibility that the RCMP did not have the authority, as stated by the Minister of Labour, to make the raid on the minister's office—whether or not it was his campaign office—search it and take certain documents, with consent or without consent? Has he looked into this matter in view of the fact that the RCMP is under his jurisdiction?

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General):** I did not understand the Minister of Labour to have said that last night.

**Some hon. Members:** He certainly did.

**Mr. Allmand:** I will re-examine his words in *Hansard*. If they are as the hon. member says they are, I will certainly look into it.

● (1500)

**Mr. Woolliams:** I could help right now. At page 3535—

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The minister has undertaken to examine the words, and if there was another question, perhaps the hon. member would like to put it.

INQUIRY AS TO ISSUANCE OF RECEIPTS FOR DOCUMENTS REMOVED FROM HAMILTON OFFICE OF MINISTER OF LABOUR

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I would like to ask the minister whether he made the statement at page 3535 of *Hansard*. Can the minister now say frankly whether he had enough presence of mind at that time when the RCMP came in without authority to demand copies of the documentation which justified the raid and whether he received receipts from them at that time covering any files, documents or any material which they removed from his office.

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know the precise date, but subsequently I received documentation, copies of which the RCMP may or may not have kept at their headquarters, wherever that might be.

PURPOSE OF SEARCH OF HAMILTON OFFICE OF MINISTER OF LABOUR

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I wonder if the minister will confirm that the RCMP raid during the week of May 27, 1974, with or without authority, was relating in some respects to the alleged impropriety and possible fraudulent dealings with reference to the Hamilton Harbour Commission. Was it relating to that commission?

[Mr. Allmand.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The point was raised yesterday about the propriety of questions touching the minister's responsibility as a minister of the Crown, which is the subject for which he is responsible in the House of Commons. I indicated then that questions which were posed yesterday which were brought under objection were not objectionable because they did not contain insinuations against the conduct of the minister in that way. Obviously, if questions are to raise that kind of insinuation, they carry with them a much different character than simply a question in the question period. I indicated at that time that I found no such insinuation but that when I did, I would indicate that I thought the question improper, and I must confess that I find that insinuation in the last question of the hon. member.

**Mr. Woolliams:** On a point of order, I am not suggesting for one moment by the question—and possibly it was my fault in the way I phrased my question—that there was any impropriety. However, a certain raid was made on the minister's office, and it was in reference to either some impropriety within the Hamilton Harbour Commission itself or something illegal, otherwise the RCMP would not be in the office. My real question is: was the raid made to seek documents in reference to the impropriety or illegalities connected with other people; nothing to do with the minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** In that sense the question would appear to be proper.

**Mr. MacEachen:** The question is absurd.

**An hon. Member:** How would he know?

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** I believe that would be a matter for the Solicitor General to answer. I cannot determine what is in the mind of someone else.

* * *

## TRANSPORT

REASON FOR WITHHOLDING PAYMENT TO CERTAIN MONTREAL COMPANIES FOR DREDGING IN ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

**Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham):** Mr. Speaker, my question is very intimately related to these matters, but it is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that there have been ministerial statements attributed to the minister outside the House that the final payment under a $21 million dredging contract to the J. P. Porter Company Limited, the McNamara Company, (marine division), and Marine Industries Limited, all, I believe, of Montreal, on the Îles d'Orleans or north traverse project in the St. Lawrence Seaway has been held up by the minister, would the minister confirm in the House that this has been help up and tell us why it has been held up.

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport):** It has been held up, Mr. Speaker.