

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, December 5, 1974

The House met at 2 p.m.

[English]

## PRIVILEGE

MR. MUNRO (HAMILTON EAST)—NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ALLEGING CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION SOLICITED FROM SEAFARERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The *Globe and Mail* this morning carried a headline which reads "Munro phoned SIU for money: police". The story under the headline says that I solicited a campaign contribution from the Seafarers' International Union. It goes on to say that some source suggested I initiated the call. This is totally false, Mr. Speaker. The facts are that Mr. Gralewicz telephoned my campaign office at a time when I was not available. I returned his call subsequently and it was during this conversation that he offered campaign support to me. I did not at any time solicit support from the SIU. As the House knows, my campaign organization received a contribution from the SIU but it was returned several weeks later.

● (1410)

**Hon. Martin O'Connell (Scarborough East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of privilege. I apologize to the Chair for not giving notice that I wanted to speak on the question of privilege. Allegations in the same context were made about me when I was Minister of Labour in 1972 to the effect that I received affidavits and documents from persons in the Seafarers' International Union concerning alleged violence and did nothing about it. I did something about it at that time and the Department of Labour heard nothing more from those people after that point. I will be glad to describe what I did at that time. It resolved the matter, at least at that time.

It is also said that I appointed Mr. McLaughlin, president of that union, to the ILO or to the United Nations. I did not do so. It is also said by Mr. Shulman and in the press that certain affidavits were supplied to me. I am informed by the Department of Labour that the specific one mentioned in the press was not received by me. There are many allegations going about in this situation. I want to clarify my own position in it.

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

**Mr. Baldwin:** Are there any more confessions?

MR. MacKAY—CANCELLATION OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE CONSIDERING ESTIMATES

**Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have just been informed that the scheduled proceedings of the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates called to consider the supplementary

estimates in connection with transport have been cancelled. I believe this is true with respect to the consideration of several other supplementary estimates, and since this concerns a matter so fundamental to the work of parliament, the examination of supplementary estimates, I should like to move—and I hope other members will support me:

That the way the scheduling has been carried out, the abrupt cancellations, and so on, be referred to the Committee on Procedure and Organization for further study.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) raised this matter earlier. In my opinion the way in which this has been done is most unsatisfactory.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has raised, without notice, a question of privilege, supported by only a very brief development of his argument. I have not noticed any other members who seem prepared to make any contribution. The hon. member has referred to the sudden cancellation of a standing committee meeting. Unless possessed of much greater detail it would be impossible for the Chair to hold that a valid question of privilege arises in respect to the proceedings of committees, certainly in respect to the scheduling of meetings or to the cancellation of a scheduled meeting. The Chair does not know the reason the meeting was cancelled and, in the circumstances, it would be most difficult to find there was a prima facie case of privilege.

This is not to say that the subject, one which has been raised on other occasions by hon. members in the last few days, is in any way less important. The question has been referred to not only by the hon. member but by two other hon. members in the last two days in the light of the fact that under the rules the time allowed for the examination of these estimates has been so greatly reduced. I hope all members on both sides of the House feel that this is an important restriction on the opportunity afforded them to carry out the important task of detailed examination of these estimates.

In this context, I repeat that it was comforting to all members, I am sure, to have the assurance of the President of the Privy Council that this whole subject of the examination of the estimates is to be considered at an early date by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.