

## SIU

inquiry, not a weak-kneed, mealy-mouthed thing nine or ten months after the issue first arose.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I will answer the series of questions the hon. member has just raised. Again, the hon. member asks why we did not conduct a full-fledged inquiry back when these matters were first raised. When he was attorney general of a province, if somebody made some charges which he would not even be able to see and which he would not be able to determine whether there was any foundation to them, would he run into the provincial legislature and appoint an inquiry? He would probably be one of the most outstandingly incompetent and unjust provincial attorneys general we have ever known. That is completely ridiculous.

The fact is, and the hon. member knows it, that when a government takes the responsibility for setting up a full-fledged inquiry which is an inquisitorial type of procedure—and the hon. member is aware of that—then in terms of political morality you have to be satisfied there is sufficient substance to the allegations to warrant an inquiry. If the hon. member wants to be sincere in these charges, he ought to look to his colleagues in the province. I gave this chronology for a purpose. This is a factual statement of the province's behaviour in making facts available to us upon which we could base any judgment for an inquiry. While there were cabinet ministers of a provincial government insisting in the provincial House on a federal inquiry, and while there were charges by Dr. Shulman, we immediately asked for the information upon which they were justifying the conclusion that the federal government, (a) should become involved, and (b) should have an inquiry.

**Mr. Lawrence:** You are involved.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Just a minute. They are the ones who are saying this. They are the ones who have the facts at their disposal which led them to that conclusion. The OPP and the metropolitan police were involved for months investigating the SIU. It seems entirely reasonable for the federal government to say, "If you are making these charges and suggesting there should be a federal inquiry, turn over to us all the information you have so that we can be in a similar position to make some judgment as to whether that type of action is warranted."

Indeed, weeks went by and we did not get the information. In the chronology here, there was a letter—I think it was dated December 11—which stated we should have a federal inquiry. They did not turn over any material or any of the facts on which they based their conclusion that there should be a federal inquiry. All these charges were being made about a cover-up and suggestions that there should be a federal inquiry. They kept laying it on the federal government, but at the same time they did not turn over any material. That is a pretty nice ploy, but I do not have to respect it and I do not respect it.

If they want the federal government to have an inquiry and institute what should be, in a democracy, a unique procedure in terms of an inquisitorial type of justice, they should be prepared to say they do not want to conduct the inquiry, they think we should do it, and give us the

[Mr. Lawrence.]

information they have which they think justifies undertaking that type of action. That did not occur.

● (1610)

What did occur? Since we did not get the information, we decided that something had to be done and that we should try to find out ourselves. A federal labour official looked into the affidavits that were turned over to us by a member or members of the opposition. Justice sent an official down to Toronto to see the relevant people in the police forces, and it was at that time, having sent our own officials and after repeated requests for information which went unanswered, that we started to get some information ourselves.

**Mr. Lawrence:** The files were turned over?

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Yes, they were, over a course of weeks. If my memory serves me correctly, the final updated report was some time in April and it was turned over to me on April 29. It was on the information that the federal people obtained that we decided to conduct this present investigation. If it had not been for the information that the federal people obtained, in my opinion to this day we still would have no facts provided by any inquiry conducted in Ontario on which to base an investigation. If that history of the situation does not leave serious questions regarding proper conduct on the part of the province of Ontario, then I do not know what does.

My hon. friend for Hamilton West has criticized me. Some of us have been criticized for months while innuendoes and slurs of all kinds have been made in regard to this situation, and I think the hon. member is fully aware of them. While they were being made, we tried to get the information that they already had in their possession so we could form some conclusions. The only conclusion we could come to was that we had to get this information ourselves, and that is what we proceeded to do in the discharge of my responsibility.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Mr. Speaker, it is already very hot in the chamber, so I will try and cool it down. I do not want to get the minister too flustered. We do not want to lose him for another month, although I do not think we would miss very much. I should like to ask a couple of brief but specific questions based on the premise that the inquiry will include looking at the voting regulations. Perhaps before putting my questions the minister could assure the House that the inquiry will include voting irregularities.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think voting irregularities would be included under both (a) and (b) of the terms of reference. The RCMP have been authorized not only to conduct an investigation as to any possible offences under the Canada Labour Code, but also to suggest where they feel no adequate protection is given by the Canada Labour Code against abuses of the nature described in this House on numerous occasions, and how the code can be strengthened.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Then based on that reply, which I am happy was an affirmative reply, I should like to question