

Oral Questions

release, and that there are ongoing investigations into possible profit-taking?

Second, can he confirm that they fully involve provincial stock exchange commissions and other authorities capable of providing a comprehensive review of what happened? If so, will he tell the House when he will come forward with the results of such an investigation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Solicitor General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I already told this House several times, and I repeat, that the next day, April 27, representatives of various stock exchanges throughout Canada said that to their knowledge, no one had profited from the early release of the budget document. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, and it seems important to me to restate it, I already told this House that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is continuing its Canada-wide investigation, including the five stock exchanges, and also representatives of the securities commissions were met with in each of those places to make sure that all areas could be covered by the investigation.

[*English*]

DISPOSITION OF REJECTED COPIES OF BUDGET IN
PREPARATION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Deputy Prime Minister and it concerns the Budget leak. The procedure used in previous years to dispose of rejected copies of the Budget consisted of either the shredding of rejected copies before leaving the printing bureau or, alternatively, the trucks carrying the document to a shredder elsewhere were to be accompanied or escorted by the RCMP. Did the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Supply and Services know of the fact that this procedure had not been followed this year when they stated in the House of Commons record on April 27 that all the precautions that have been taken in previous years were applied again this year? Did the Government know that the information provided to the House on

that day was inaccurate, or is it just another happy coincidence?

Hon. Paul Dick (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I would inform the House that the Hon. Member who has just spoken once again has his facts wrong. The procedure used this year and for many years in the past has been that surplus materials which might otherwise be discarded are bound up, compacted and held within the printing plant in a secure location until after the Budget has been released publicly.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, we can tell how secure it was, we sure can.

[*Translation*]

THE SECOND BUDGET LEAK—REQUEST AS TO WHO TOOK
DECISION TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Earlier, in his answer to another question, the Deputy Prime Minister said that although several ministers or at least their offices had been informed of the second Budget leak on April 27 before Question Period, none of the ministers had been informed before or during Question Period.

Could the Deputy Prime Minister now name the person who made the decision to hide this information, not from one minister, if we are to believe the Deputy Prime Minister, but from the entire Cabinet? Who made that decision and why?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish the Hon. Member would pay attention. I said earlier today during this Question Period that it was not necessary to take a decision. The decision was taken on Wednesday night as to how the Budget would be proceeded with. It was released at about 10 p.m. or 10.30 p.m. That is when the effective date of the Budget went into place and anything pertaining to an allegation of a leak, real or otherwise, perceived or potential, was a matter to be turned over to police authorities for a full investigation. That is what