

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CONSEQUENCES OF GRISÉ AFFAIR

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether the Government is as concerned as the Official Opposition about the continued presence in the House of a Member of Parliament, twice elected as a Conservative, who has been convicted of fraud and breach of trust?

If the Government is concerned about that, I would like to ask the Minister what the Government intends to do about it?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes and, to a large extent, the matter is for the House of Commons to deal with as well as Members on the government side.

This matter has been raised in the House of Commons. The Prime Minister is seized of the issue. He will be returning some time later this week and I would expect that he would want to deal with it.

In the meantime Mr. Grisé may very well take the opportunity to choose an honourable course of action. Perhaps Members may want to consider that as well.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, you have been seized with this issue. It is not only a matter for Government. It is a matter for the House of Commons. Needless to say, we are very disturbed about it.

STATEMENTS MADE BY CABINET MINISTERS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the light of that answer, I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister if he will dissociate the Government from statements made by the Minister of Transport and the junior Minister of Finance that the Member should be allowed to make up his own mind, and from the Chairman of the Caucus that it is not up to us to judge him, of the Minister of Justice that this individual should be given a break—

Mr. Speaker: We have been through this line of questioning a few days ago. The Speaker is in the position where the question is really out of order unless it relates to the administration of the Government. That

Oral Questions

is why I think the Hon. Member is probably on difficult ground in pursuing it.

The Hon. Minister may want to respond.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had responded in an appropriate fashion, but perhaps not to the satisfaction of the Hon. Member.

However, I want to remind him and other Members that he is not a member of the Progressive Conservative Caucus. He does sit as an independent Member. I am as disturbed as he is, and I am sure other Members are, about this particular issue.

Anything that we can do individually and/or collectively to deal with this issue in a proper manner so as not to undermine the integrity of the House of Commons and all Hon. Members is something that we would all be interested in doing.

Simply to assure the Hon. Member, from a government point of view we are seized with the issue notwithstanding the fact that it becomes more than a government issue, but we hope that we can deal with it in a proper manner.

* * *

THE BUDGET

DECISION REGARDING SECOND BUDGET LEAK

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat a question to the Deputy Prime Minister that perhaps he has either failed to understand or—and I would hate to suspect this—refuses to answer. The question is quite simple.

When the Government became aware of the second leak to an \$11-billion financial institution, we are asked to believe that no Minister of the Crown, neither the Deputy Prime Minister, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Justice knew about it for nearly two hours.

However, once those Ministers I have just named knew about it, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister, who took the decision not to come into Parliament that day, the next day, or any subsequent day in the next 27 days and tell Parliament about that second leak? Whose decision was that? The Prime Minister's? The Deputy Prime Minister's? The Minister of Finance's? Who made the decision?