

Privilege—Mr. Waddell

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered that question, but I would be happy to try to respond again.

As I understand it, the nature of the RCMP inquiry was initiated given the fact that a journalist was on television saying that he had received what appeared to be, as qualified by himself, proceeds from a crime, from a criminal.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): A crime? How do you know?

Mr. Mulroney: This is the statement made by the journalist.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Is Small a criminal because he received it? I would like to know the answer to that.

Mr. Mulroney: The RCMP is conducting a full investigation. That investigation extends to the actions of presumably all of those involved in that part of it, and also extends to the stock exchanges to ascertain if anybody has profited in any way from any kind of information. Thus far there is no indication whatsoever of that. However, the Solicitor General has said if any information comes to him he will report to the House immediately, and I know if my friend has any accusations or any specific information he will make it known to the RCMP.

Mr. Speaker: Prior to the noon adjournment we were dealing with a number of questions of privilege and the Hon. Member for Kamloops had the floor. I will return to that Hon. Member in a few minutes.

However, I have received a question of privilege arising out of this Question Period and I will hear the Hon. Member for Port—Moody Coquitlam.

* * *

PRIVILEGE**MOTION UNDER S.O. 26(2)—EXTENSION OF SITTING**

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I refer to yesterday's *Hansard* at page 1001.

During Question Period today the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lewis) told the House that he rose in the House at 5.45 p.m. and tried to continue the sitting of the House because he thought that there was a Budget leak. He indicated that he had facts about the Budget leak, and in

his answer to the question he indicated that he had a call from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson).

Yesterday at 5.45 p.m. I was about to speak, and at page 1001 of *Hansard* I raised a point of order when I was interrupted by the Minister who stated:

That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of second reading of Bill C-9, an Act to amend the Bank Act.

The Minister was not telling the truth to the House. He was seeking to adjourn—

Mr. Speaker: There are ways and places to make a charge, and I am sure the Hon. Member has an argument here. However, I have some difficulty understanding where the point of privilege is. When the Hon. Member completes his submission, I would like him to show where there is a point of privilege. I know the Hon. Member will want to put his remarks in such a manner that he is not transgressing the rules.

Mr. Waddell: Had the Minister indicated to the House at that point that there was a problem with the Budget, then it quite likely would have been possible to continue the sitting of the House. The Minister did not tell the House that. Indeed, in my submission now, he is telling us the opposite. He misled the House and misled me. I say that is a question of breach of privilege of the House.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, my friend is correct in his citation of *Hansard vis-à-vis* the page. However, I indicated earlier that when I rose yesterday there was no discussion. I made the only motion possible at that time, which was the continuation of consideration of second reading of Bill C-9, an Act to amend the Bank Act. We made that very clear.

I have made it clear outside the House and I have made it clear inside the House that we had an indication of a Budget leak. At that time that was all it was. However, we felt if we could keep the House open we would then have a forum which is open to all Canadians and televised instantaneously to make this matter public.

An Hon. Member: Why didn't you say that yesterday?

Mr. Lewis: There was no co-operation at a quarter to six, and there was no co-operation at 8.30 p.m. either.

Mr. Benjamin: If you wanted co-operation, why didn't you tell us?