

As a result of this Minister's culpable indiscretion and lack of prudence, he has created a fatal flaw in the confidence of the House and the country. What was opened as a crack in the Gillespie affair is now a virtual chasm. It is a chasm that the Minister cannot cross. As a result of his clowning and desire for personal publicity, he made available across this country, to the moneymarkets and financial circles, an advance knowledge of the budget which could be used for personal gain.

Anyone with a knowledge of finance, being aware of the amount of the deficit revealed by the Minister and the amount of incentives to be raised by job creation—

Which, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, was included in that Budget.

—would be able to draw certain conclusions which might be of great interest in financial circles and make available that gain.

In other words, private gain for certain individuals who would possess prior knowledge.

He continued:

It is not incumbent upon us at this time to show that great profits have been made, or even that it was possible for such to have taken place. Nor was this a case in the episode of Mr. Dalton or Mr. Thomas.

The following is the most important of my remarks:

Their resignation took place before the investigations by a special committee were made. It was merely necessary to show that a budget leak had taken place in those precedents. The resignations followed immediately and automatically.

In other words, proof was not necessary. The possibility of such an action taking place was sufficient to result in their resignations.

The Member for Yukon continued:

In this country in 1963 Mr. Walter Gordon's resignation went to the Prime Minister when he admitted bringing in outside economic advisers.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, as a student of history, and knowing the individual personally, that he registered serious concern. The remarks continue:

No leak was shown. All that was shown in that case was that Mr. Gordon had consulted four economists in the preparation of his budget. When that was disclosed, he immediately tendered his resignation to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, who chose not to accept it. But nonetheless, the proper thing was done and the resignation was tendered. That does not alter the fact, Madam Speaker, that the resignation was tendered.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find the House very sympathetic to the position that the Chair allow Members a reasonable amount of time in which to put forth their questions of privilege in order that you can decide whether or not a *prima facie* case of a breach of privilege has been made. While we find the remarks of the Hon. Member for Yukon to be interesting, this is not a case in which a question of privilege is being used as an escape valve to let off steam in the House. Therefore, I wonder if the Hon. Member might come directly to his question of privilege in order that the Chair may consider this and we may get on with it.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair thanks the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for his intervention. I was just about to rise to ask the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) whether he could assist the Chair in making a clear link between the situation of a leak of budget information and the

present grievance which the Hon. Member brings to the House.

There is a convention, albeit not a rule, with respect to leaks of budget information which puts very great pressure on the Minister. Perhaps the Member could assist the Chair by showing exactly how those examples are apposite to the grievance which the Hon. Member brings which, as I understand it, briefly put, is that information as to the contents of a Bill which was going to be introduced into this Chamber somehow or other got out of the hands of the Government of Canada and was received by a stranger, if I can put it that way, before Hon. Members could see the Bill. That seems to be the grievance which the Hon. Member brings to the Chair.

I ask that he now concentrate on the link which I have asked him to establish. I do not say it is necessary to establish that link. As the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has said, Members are impressed with the erudition of the presentation, but I now ask the Hon. Member to tighten up his presentation and get to the point in order that the Chair can deal with the matter. The Chair should advise the Hon. Member that the Chair views the matter as serious.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your intervention. I also appreciate the intervention made by the Parliamentary Secretary. I think it was appropriate. However, I would point out that the comments of the Hon. Member for Yukon went on for many more pages than I referred to. That is just to make the point that this is a very serious issue. As you have indicated, Mr. Speaker, you concur. I appreciate the intervention and will draw my comments to a rapid conclusion, knowing that other Members will want to participate in this discussion.

● (1220)

To put the concern very succinctly, we learned that the former president of the U.S. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association indicated clearly that he had prior knowledge of the contents of Bill C-22. I presume that the next number of days will determine whether will lead to significant changes in the amount of research, if any, being done in Canada, as well as the type of research. It will affect the success of Canadian drug companies and the relative success in Canada of multinational drug companies, particularly those located in the United States.

My point is that individuals having prior knowledge of the content of the Bill would obviously stand to gain financially and privately because of the implications that this information regarding these companies would have in terms of the value of their stocks on the stock-market or the value of the company operations *per se*.

I have attempted to relate this as being as serious a breach of privilege as that experienced when a budget leak occurs. As you have indicated, Mr. Speaker, the experience here and in the mother of parliament is very clear when it comes to budget leaks. I see a direct relationship between the two and suggest