

*Oral Questions*

now accused me of not being independent and he has made other insinuations against me. I ask him, as did the Minister of Labour yesterday, if he has charges against me, to lay them before the House and we will go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

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

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** That is all bluster.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** No guts.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Perth-Wilmot has a question for the Acting Prime Minister.

**Mr. Jarvis:** I rise on the question of privilege raised by the Solicitor General. I made absolutely no insinuations yesterday or today. I simply said, in a question to the Acting Prime Minister, that the Solicitor General had called Mr. Shulman a muckraker, someone who has no respect for the truth. I also prefaced my question yesterday by saying if the Solicitor General had been quoted accurately. My whole purpose in putting my question was not to make insinuations about the Solicitor General but to simply say he cannot remain independent when the RCMP by statute is directly responsible to the minister and the minister, rightly or wrongly, is the subject matter of part of this interim report. How can any reasonable person expect the Solicitor General to be independent in judging a report the very nature of which is to be independent? For the Solicitor General's own sake, would it not be far better that this investigation be conducted independently of him?

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

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question was addressed to me, although it got a little mixed up in the process. I have confidence in the Solicitor General, in his independence, and I do not think the fact that he has characterized certain statements made by Mr. Shulman as being lies does in any way interfere with his independence.

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

**An hon. Member:** Spurious argument.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** The worst one you put up yet.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** In light of the fact that the Solicitor General and the Minister of Labour asked for an investigation, and in light of the fact that the Prime Minister said they will weigh the evidence, they will decide, in light of the fact that they are the interested parties, there is a conflict of interest if they are to weigh their own evidence and act as judge and jury. I hope the minister will answer me. Does the Acting Prime Minister not see in that situation an inherent danger in not appointing an independent judicial body under the Inquiries Act, as was suggested this morning, so as to clear the air for the government, if nothing more?

**Mr. Sharp:** It seems to me that we are still getting confused about the inquiries that are being proposed. Two

types of inquiries have been proposed: one by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, another by the House leader of the Conservative party. So far as the investigation of the charges by Mr. Shulman are concerned, involving the possibility of impropriety on the part of ministers or public servants, that has been turned over to one of the most independent bodies in this country, which is the RCMP.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I agree with the Acting Prime Minister that the RCMP are respectable and independent.

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

**Mr. Woolliams:** But we have continually heard from the Acting Prime Minister, the Solicitor General, the Minister of Labour and any other minister who is involved in making decisions that there is no evidence now. They are weighing their own evidence resulting from their own investigation. Does the Acting Prime Minister not see some inherent danger in allowing them to weigh their own evidence and coming to a decision as would a judge and jury investigating themselves. Would he not relieve them of this responsibility and clear the situation? Surely, he can see that it is time to have an independent inquiry, as suggested by several responsible members this morning.

**Mr. Sharp:** The answer is in the negative. If there are any charges of impropriety against a minister, it is the House that should decide. I suggest to members opposite, if they have evidence of this kind, surely they should not depend on a member of the NDP in the Ontario legislature to prove the basis of their charges. Let them make them, and this House can have a full and complete inquiry to satisfy everyone.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SEAFARERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION—REASON FOR SHOWING MINISTER OF LABOUR INTERIM REPORT FROM RCMP—STATEMENTS IN TORONTO "SUN"

**Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Wednesday in the House he said that if the investigation had been into the Minister of Labour he would not have received the report. In light of the fact that RCMP sources were reported in yesterday's Toronto *Sun* to have said that the Minister of Labour was actively under investigation and in light of the fact that the *Sun* reported that Gordon McCaffrey, executive assistant to the Minister of Labour, confirmed that fact, can the minister explain why the Minister of Labour was allowed to see the report when he had said earlier that had the Minister of Labour been investigated he would not have seen the report?

● (1140)

**Mr. Allmand:** As soon as—

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, may I answer the question about the Toronto *Sun* article. I would not pretend for a moment that I would personally accept anything necessarily as authentic merely because it appears in the Toronto *Sun*, but I would say this: It should be clear to this House that I asked, when these allegations were made by Mr. Shulman, for the