

Quigley embarrassed the Government in a political way. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) pointed out, as a result of the public service that Mr. Quigley provided to the people of Canada, the system was reformed and made better.

We call into question the reason why Mr. Quigley was fired and ask you to consider the ramifications of this particular case on individual Members of Parliament being required to appear before a grievance committee.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, it states at page 67 of *Erskine May Parliamentary Practice*, Nineteenth Edition:

The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers"(c). They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its Members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity.

I respectfully submit that if Members of Parliament are impeded in any way from raising issues in the House for fear that those who have, for good reason, given that information to Members of the House would be threatened with dismissal for reporting matters which are wrong, to those who are elected to govern in this country, then parliamentary privileges of this House could have been breached by the action taken by the Deputy Minister, and perhaps the Minister in this particular case.

I hope you will take the time to examine the situation and report to the House whether there is a prima facie case of breach of privileges of the House, as I believe there is, as a result of the action of Mr. Lussier against this employee of the civil service.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I enter into this debate with some hesitation because I think it is very important that Mr. Quigley be able to exercise all of his rights as a former employee of the Government. It is my understanding that he has exercised his right to present a grievance against the Deputy Minister's decision. I suggest, therefore, that it would be very inappropriate for the Government to comment at length at this time.

I suggest that you examine whether or not the rights and privileges of a Member of the House have been breached which, after all, is the purpose of the privilege grievance. As far as we are concerned, we do not believe there has been any breach of the Member's privilege.

Considering that a grievance has been lodged by the said employee, we do not wish to comment any further at this time.

Mr. Speaker: I think a matter of some importance has been brought to the attention of the Chair by the Hon. Member for LaPrairie (Mr. Jourdenais), the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) and the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr.

Petitions

Boudria). Under the circumstances, I think it would be appropriate if the Chair looked carefully at the representations that have been made.

Of course, the Chair is cognizant of the caveat put forward by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary which was also expressed by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) during Question Period, that the employee who forms the basis of this question of privilege is presently going through a grievance process. However, it should be noted by the House that the representations made in this particular matter cross party lines most definitely and there is obviously a strong sense of unanimity among Members from different Parties that this is a matter of some considerable concern to the chamber. The Chair will treat it as such and will report back in due course.

* * *

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I admit once again to being involved in other things, but did my hon. colleague's question of privilege not come up immediately after the tabling of the electoral report for the Province of Alberta? If it did, have we passed by Tabling of Documents?

• (1520)

Mr. Speaker: It may not have been clear to all Hon. Members. The Chair called Tabling of Documents and then recognized the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais), but I am sure it would be the disposition of the House to allow the Parliamentary Secretary to go back to Tabling of Documents if he has documents. I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have none. I just wanted to determine exactly where we were in the Routine Proceedings. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: We have been through Statements by Ministers, Presenting Reports from Interparliamentary Delegations and Presenting Reports from Committees.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PETITIONS

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CHANGES TO PATENT ACT

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions which all deal with the same subject matter. They have been approved pursuant to Standing Order 106. These petitions are from residents of such places as Regina, Saskatchewan, Toronto, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. There are several hundred names in all. The petitioners state that the federal Government's proposals to change the Patent Act relating to prescription drugs will increase drug prices for Canadian consumers and will severely