

Privilege

Finally, I would like to present a crucial piece of evidence, the *Minutes and Proceedings* of June 12, at which time the member for Surrey North and myself among other members were in attendance. Page 122 of the report indicates concurrence and: "It was agreed that the draft report as amended be concurred in". That is in the proceedings of our committee. Shall I say the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* applies?

In conclusion, I would just like to say that it is sad for a member or a colleague to use an unfounded allegation against another. It becomes even more sad when a colleague uses unfounded allegation to breach House convention.

Allow me to quote what he said:

This misrepresentation of my position caused me embarrassment and forced me in order to set the record straight to breach House conventions and release my minority report at noon.

That was five hours before the report was released and three hours before he raised his question of privilege. He had ample time to raise his question and not breach House conventions. Is he telling the House that two wrongs would make a right?

I trust I have proven to the appreciation of this House that the serious allegations that the member for Surrey North did level against this hon. member speaking were unfounded and, should he wish to pursue his grievance further as to facts, I invite him to bring his case before the standing committee where the matter emanated and where it can properly and more fully be debated.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I want to just make three or four very brief responses. First, the member was given notice on June 19. His office was given notice on June 19 that I was going to raise the matter.

Second, if he will read what I said in the House on June 19, I at no time accused him of leaking the report. It says clearly that the report was released prematurely. It made no reference as to who released the report.

Third, if he discussed it with the press—and as he said he went too far—that is on his own conscience. That has nothing to do with what I raised in the House.

Fourth, what I said is that he indicated that there was unanimous agreement with the report when he knew full well that I had voted in committee against recommenda-

tion 1, that I had voted in committee for not concurring in the report and that his implying to the media that I supported the government and the Liberals in their unanimous agreement on the report caused me embarrassment and forced me to clarify the situation.

I think the hon. member should simply acknowledge that he discussed too much with the press too soon and that he misrepresented my position on that committee.

Mr. Speaker: This matter was first raised by the hon. member for Surrey North on June 19, 1991. At that time, as it seemed to be a matter emanating from a committee, I did not act on the representations that were given to me. Subsequently the hon. member for Winnipeg North, as the hon. members have heard, has taken issue with some of the things that were said on June 19 by the hon. member for Surrey North.

I have listened to both hon. members who have aired their grievance, but I think the better course to follow is to view those statements by both members as certainly conscientious on each member's part although there may be a difference of opinion between them as to the effect of the various things that took place at that time.

I think that both members have had a chance to explain their position to the House and I think that we should move on.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity that I have had to raise this matter of privilege. It arises from a June 5, 1991 press release from the Canadian Gas Association which I have provided to you. This press release was widely distributed and contains false statements about a committee of this House of which I am a member.

My privilege is partly a question of fact and partly a question of law. It is extremely serious for two reasons. First, the unanimous Standing Committee on the Environment report *Out of Balance* deals with global warming, an issue the committee concluded is a severe threat to Canada and to the world. Second, the statement contained on page 2 of the Canadian Gas Association press release that the standing committee "has come to agree with Canadian Gas Association statistics" is absolutely false and the Canadian Gas Association has failed to withdraw it despite contact by myself.