of incentives to be raised for job creation, would be able to draw certain conclusions which might be of great interest in financial circles and make available that gain.

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. 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.

• (1110)

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

What we are talking about here is not in the book of rules. We are talking about the absolute necessity that the integrity and the probity of the Minister of Finance with regard to the budget be maintained. The Minister of Finance in his heart of hearts knows this. The Prime Minister knows it. It is more than a matter of tradition and precedent, although they weigh very heavily on this issue; it is a matter of practical necessity.

The public must be satisfied at all times that no person is in a position to profit from budgetary transactions through advance disclosure. The Minister of Finance showed his awareness of this by insisting that the media remain locked up until after he had finished speaking. Such was this solicitude about premature leaking that he went to lengths never dreamed of by other Ministers of Finance. He would have been well advised to show the same care in his own actions. The fact remains that the Minister's capacity—and that is what is at stake here—to continue to function as Minister of Finance has been irreparably damaged by his own lack of prudence and his own fault. The credibility of his budget has been placed in question along with his own credibility. This leaves the Minister the only option of resignation and the production and presentation of a new budget by a new Minister to be appointed to replace him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: You would want, Madam Speaker, to have exposed for your consideration some evidence. That is all that is necessary for you to find that there exists a prime facie case of privilege so that you might put the question to the House as to whether or not a reference should be made to a special committee to consider the circumstances, as was done in the Hugh Dalton case. I stress "some" evidence; it is not incumbent upon any Member of the House to satisfy the Chair that that evidence beyond any reasonable shadow of a doubt convinces you that there was a leak. All the Chair requires is some evidence to warrant the matter being put to the House.

What is that evidence? As I say, Madam Speaker, I have a copy of the videotape. That videotape has been shown across the country on television networks since yesterday afternoon. It continues to play this morning. The extent of the leaks go far beyond "some" evidence.

First, the budget is called a budget of recovery.

Second, it will be highlighted by a $4.6 billion job creation program which will push the 1982-83 deficit to $31.2 billion. Nothing can be more specific than those figures.

Third, the Minister tonight will announce a number of incentives to private enterprise, through which he admits the most jobs can be created and be of a more permanent nature than Government can do. Here we have the third piece of evidence.

Fourth, the Minister will state in his budget that his $4.6 billion job creation program is designed to get the country out of the mood of depression and restore its confidence in the future.

Fifth, the Minister of Finance will say the Government can help give that confidence back to Canadians, but the real action will have to come from the private sector.

Sixth, the Minister will call upon Canadians to mobilize their resources and make the economy more productive and competitive.

Seventh, there will be a two-fold purpose in the budget. The Minister wants to start the recovery process and do so in such a way that it lasts for a long time.

• (1115)

Eighth, the Minister of Finance says his employment measures will have an immediate effect and will have long-term benefits.

Ninth, the budget will state that if the Government did not spend the $4.6 billion on job programs, investments in both the private and public sectors would be delayed and thus stall early economic recovery.

Tenth, the Finance Minister will say that if he did not inject such a large sum into the economy, the $31.2 billion projected deficit would have been much higher.

Those are translations from the French text that were lifted verbatim from the pages telephotoed by the CHCH Hamilton TV cameraman in the Minister's office yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Clark: At the Minister's invitation.

Mr. Nielsen: At the Minister's invitation, I might add. Those ten specific verbatim references to the budget go far beyond meeting the standard test of presenting to the Chair some evidence. Those ten leaks provide the Chair with enough evidence, if it were your job, which it is not, to convict the Minister, resting only on those ten points. But the Chair need not go that far. The Chair need find only that there is some