

Also, the Hon. Minister's point is defective because he did not say that if you found a prima facie case of privilege he would move a motion referring the matter to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure. He has not stated that intention and his point is therefore defective.

Finally, I respectfully refer you to page 12 of Beauchesne's, citation 19, which says:

A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

The Hon. Minister has raised a grievance about what the Hon. Member said. I respectfully submit that it cannot be a point of order for the reasons I have stated, and certainly it cannot be a valid question of privilege.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two points, if I may, on this question of privilege. Both of them are directly related to the comments of the House Leader of the Official Opposition.

First, if time were to be of the essence in every question of privilege, as the Member alleges, there would be very few questions of privilege debated. I think the Speaker has been wise in allowing questions of privilege to be aired as a safety valve, as a method of allowing Members to expound upon their points of view. I think we should continue to ignore the time factor in favour of allowing questions of privilege to be brought forward as a safety valve.

Second, I noted with interest my hon. friend's argument that a question of privilege must be concluded with a motion. I welcome his joining me in this argument. He has argued the other side of the case on previous occasions, I believe. I have made the argument time and again that a question of privilege must be concluded with a motion. If not the Member himself, other members of his Party have disagreed with me and I welcome his joining with me on this technical point. The Hon. Minister has made his case. It may indeed be a matter of debate, but I think we have aired it.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): You have erred, that's right.

Mr. Lewis: As my colleague has pointed out, no one would suggest for a minute that the Hon. Minister would deliberately mislead the House. I conclude my argument on that point and leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to decide on the question of privilege.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, as a somewhat dispassionate observer, being neither a member of the Party, a member of which, it is being suggested, has suggested that another person has misled the House, or a member of the Party of the Minister who is making the point, it seems to me that the problem is that there is no point really. In order to mislead the House you must have some leadership in the House. To "mislead" you must have some "lead" and then you mislead.

Question of Privilege—Mrs. Sparrow

The problem is that we are not getting any statements at all from the Minister with respect to this deal. He should stand up and make a statement in the House and not smuggle it in on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: The Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) has evidenced again his great genius at managing to find ways to make points on behalf of the people he represents. Hon. Members will, of course, appreciate the points which he has made.

I will check the "blues" carefully. I want to thank the Minister and Hon. Members for their representations. I will give them careful consideration.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED DIVULGING OF *IN CAMERA* COMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a question of privilege with regard to confidential information from an *in camera* committee hearing being made public. I respectfully refer to Erskine May, Nineteenth Edition, page 146, Chapter X "Breaches of Privilege and Contempts", which reads as follows:

The publication or disclosure of proceedings of committees conducted with closed doors or of draft reports of committees before they have been reported to the House will, however, constitute a breach of privilege or a contempt.

On Tuesday, May 5, 1987, your Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources met *in camera* to discuss a motion previously adopted. A great deal of debate occurred, and at the termination of this debate a motion was adopted to rescind the previous motion. Approximately 30 to 40 minutes following this meeting the press phoned my office, recited the discussions, the motion, and the exact way the committee voted and then, of course, asked for my comments in reply, to which I said everything was confidential.

On May 6, 1987, the following day, a Canadian Press article appeared in *The Calgary Sun* which described the committee proceedings on the motion as follows:

● (1530)

At yesterday's review, two Conservatives voted to reverse that decision, a committee member told the Canadian Press. Another Tory and a Liberal MP voted to stick to the original decision. Conservative chairman, Barbara Sparrow, who urged the committee to look at last week's decision again, cast the deciding vote.

Articles also appeared in *The Ottawa Citizen* and *The Edmonton Journal*. I have those articles if you wish to see them.

My duties as a Member of Parliament, a member of a Standing Committee of the House and also as a chairman of that Committee have been degraded, curtailed and indeed somewhat inhibited by the leak of confidential information.