

totally, absolutely untrue, and he knows it and he should refrain from making statements like that.

Simply, the manner in which the Budget was going to be handled as a result of the extraordinary circumstances that occurred on Wednesday, April 26, was first to seek the co-operation of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party to allow the House to be reconvened so that a proper presentation and statement could be made. That was not forthcoming.

The issue of the Doug Small leak was a matter of public knowledge at that particular time. It was turned over to the RCMP at that time, and that investigation was started, and any other relationship to any other allegations. The next day there was a whole series of allegations and suggestions about further leaks. As a matter of fact, an article in *The Globe and Mail* indicates that many leaks were reported to the RCMP special unit. "Mounties suggest one suspect linked to both budget leaks". "Police probe reveals widespread leaks".

I am saying that at that time, the process for the introduction of the Budget which took place on Wednesday, April 26, at about 10 p.m. or 10.30 p.m., was in fact the *de facto* presentation of the Budget to the people of Canada. Anything else related to any suggestions or potential leaks was immaterial because the die had been cast, and it had now become a matter for the law enforcement agencies to take its proper course. That is exactly what was done.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, the House will note, as will the country, that the Deputy Prime Minister has not replied to my question as to when he personally was advised of the leak to the Mutual Life Assurance Company, and he did not reply as to whether or not he ordered officials not to inform the Minister of Finance.

[Translation]

REQUEST AS TO WHEN PRIME MINISTER WAS INFORMED
OF SECOND LEAK

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Government is not only engaged in a cover-up, it is also thumbing its nose at Canadians.

I have the following question for the Deputy Prime Minister. Why did the Prime Minister refuse to say exactly when he was informed of the second leak, the

Oral Questions

one to Mutual Life of Canada? Was it because the Prime Minister wanted to avoid having to explain to the House why he misled it during Question Period on April 27?

When was the Prime Minister informed? Was it the Prime Minister who decided not to inform the Minister of Finance immediately?

• (1420)

[English]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition for not answering one aspect of a many faceted question. When I returned to my office from Question Period on April 27, I had received a call from the Clerk of the Privy Council which I returned. It was some time, I would suspect, about 3.30 or toward four o'clock that I returned the call. I was advised of additional information that had been drawn to his attention. I can assume that about approximately the same time he would have informed the Prime Minister. But, Mr. Speaker, this information is immaterial to the case because it was part and parcel—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Max Keeping had suggested that he had evidence of a further leak. Now are we supposed to treat Mr. Max Keeping and other allegations or potential leaks a little differently?

The fact of the matter is that the Budget was tabled to the people of Canada the night before, Wednesday, April 26, and anything that occurred thereafter was irrelevant to that fact. It then became a law enforcement matter, and he knows the consequences of commenting on something that is before the RCMP, unless my learned friend wants to conduct an RCMP investigation on the floor of the House of Commons. He knows that that is not the proper course.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have no inclination to conduct an RCMP investigation on the floor of the House of Commons, but I do intend to conduct a parliamentary investigation on the floor of the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!