

Privilege

the false statement without going beyond what I believe would be the bounds.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion that these matters, even though they have been alleged to have flowed from the committee and its deliberations, will in fact be the case because the committee has not completed its discussions, the discussions will be continued this afternoon, tomorrow and perhaps even longer.

I think that we should examine the Chair's ruling of May 5, 1987 involving the case raised by the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake involving the member from Kenora—Rainy River on April 28, 1987. I believe that you, Sir, put the case quite well in your ruling. I will not, therefore, repeat everything that was said there.

However, I do think that this causes a great dilemma for persons like myself who have been involved in these discussions and who have subsequently received numerous inquiries and telephone calls from reporters and the general public. Really, I am in no position at this point to respond positively or negatively, or to explain, defend or deny certain charges.

Therefore, I believe that there has been a substantive breach of privilege. I bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that you examine it. If you find that there is a prima facie case, I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion.

Mr. Douglas Young (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to enter into debate on this matter, but I can certainly sympathize with the member's very awkward position. In his alleged problem he has referred to both opposition parties, when in fact it could have been mentioned that reports allegedly were coming from members of his own party with respect to some purported recommendations of the finance committee.

I would simply indicate to you, Sir, that the review that took place by the finance committee of evidence brought before it was in fact the subject of a great deal of discussion. I might point out that the chairman of the finance committee dealing with the goods and services proposal of the government has speculated a great deal on a number of issues, including the matters raised by the hon. member in his presentation. I would agree on one point. There is no report to which one could refer,

because no report was drafted at Mont Ste. Marie, nor were any recommendations made by the committee.

Although I acknowledge the perhaps awkward position the hon. member was put in as a result of these reports in the press, I would suggest that since no report has in fact been drafted nor evidently finalized, and since no recommendations have been made, any indications as to what may be emanating would be the result of some suggestions made by members of the committee from all parties. Until such time as a final report is made, there could not be any breach of privilege because there would be nothing of a substantial nature to leak.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out the same thing. To my knowledge there has been no report prepared, because it has not been finished yet. In fact, we are meeting later today to consider the said report. To my knowledge there has been no evidence leaked, no documents leaked and, therefore, no point of privilege.

The one reference made by the member opposite to myself was from an article in *The Financial Post* where I am quoted as saying that "They'll", meaning the Conservative majority, "recommend 7 per cent on a broader base". I have been saying that for about two months publicly. I know that my friend from the Liberal party has been saying a similar thing as well publicly for a couple of months. That is no reference in any detail to what a committee report may or may not say.

I also want to say that I do feel in an awkward position as well. At the outset I said that I could not understand why certain members were referring to what might be in the committee report because it put us all, like the member from Edmonton, in a very awkward position as to whether we should comment or not. The committee chairman himself is a person who publicly raised the possibility of a tax on resale housing. This came, as the member from Edmonton knows, from the chairman himself before we went to Mont Ste. Marie.

Then, on about November 11 or 12 three Conservative members of the committee who wished to remain anonymous had allegedly given a lot of details of the so-called report to certain journalists. I read about it when I was in Saskatchewan that weekend. I was called to comment on