

As for the document itself, I would hope the hon. member would send me a copy of it. I cannot rule on this question without having seen the document.

As for other members of this House needing to see the document, that may be so in an absolute way once I have ruled whether a prima facie case of privilege is found in the question raised by the hon. member. If the hon. member wants his document to be seen by a number of members, he has many ways at his disposal in order to do so. He may use the distribution services of the House of Commons or he may hand it out to members around him who may have an interest.

Concerning his request to have it appended to *Hansard*, I am in the hands of the House and that requires unanimous consent. From what I heard from the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), I do not suppose the House would give unanimous consent. Therefore, I am unable to act on that request.

In regard to the total question as it was presented by the various hon. members, I hope to see the document. Members raising a question of privilege can refer to documents and they usually make these known to the Chair. I should like to take this question of privilege under advisement.

MR. SARGEANT—CANADA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECTS IN MANITOBA—MINISTER'S STATEMENT

**Madam Speaker:** I have a question of privilege in the name of the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant). Before the hon. member rises, from the statement he made to me it seems he wants to discuss a ruling I made yesterday. He refers to the answer given by the hon. Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy), and that is what the question of privilege he raised yesterday was all about. However, if the hon. member is rising on something else, I will hear it.

**Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake):** Madam Speaker, my question of privilege today arises out of a charge made by the minister in his comments yesterday when he said my allegations were "dead wrong." I contend that by saying this he has violated my privileges as a member of this House. He further went on to say as reported on page 5536 of yesterday's *Hansard*:

The projects for Manitoba constituencies were approved well over a week ago and sent to the regional office for distribution. There was no hold-up in my office.

Upon further examination yesterday I find that as of three o'clock yesterday afternoon Eastern Standard Time the Winnipeg regional office had only received the 12 project approvals—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member is discussing the ruling made yesterday. Having taken a look at *Hansard*, this is precisely the point discussed yesterday during the course of that question of privilege. I am afraid I cannot hear him if he continues in that vein.

*Privilege—Mr. Sargeant*

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker, may I request you listen to my friend for a moment or two. Your Honour will find he wants to report something which happened after the ruling was made yesterday. It concerns something he learned from Winnipeg after the matter was raised in the House.

**Mr. Sargeant:** That is correct, Madam Speaker. I wish to bring forth further information which might indicate the hon. minister did not give us a correct answer in the House yesterday. He said the projects for the Manitoba constituencies were approved well over a week ago and sent to the regional offices. However, as of three o'clock Eastern Standard Time yesterday, the Winnipeg office had only received the 12 projects to which I referred in my question. Subsequently, at approximately 3.30 Eastern Standard Time, a matter of a few minutes after I brought the subject up in this House, the Winnipeg regional office received a phone call from the minister's office indicating that project approvals would be sent later that day, not a week ago. At about four o'clock Winnipeg time, five o'clock our time, these approvals were being transmitted by telecopier or telex to the Winnipeg office. The staff at the Winnipeg regional office was required to work late yesterday to transfer this information. I really think at this point my case can rest.

I contend that my privilege was violated when the minister charged that I was dead wrong. I think this is especially so since we now learn a different set of facts than those put to this House by the hon. minister. A great disservice is done when a minister of the Crown makes such inaccurate charges against an opposition member. With all due respect, I would request that the minister be asked to withdraw his charge against me, that he apologize, and that he set the record straight for this House.

[Translation]

**Mr. Dennis Dawson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** On the same question of privilege, Madam Speaker, I remind the hon. member that the minister admitted yesterday that not all projects had been completed in this \$137 million program. He clearly stated that as far as Manitoba was concerned the projects had been approved. He made sure that if there were delays in the correspondence, which leads to a question of privilege in the House—he made sure that this had left the minister's office. When you are dealing with a \$137 million program, with I do not know how many projects, with 282 MPs to satisfy and 282 advisory committees, it is difficult to ensure that all ridings are at the same stage. The minister therefore asked me in my capacity as parliamentary secretary to make sure that the decision for all projects was sent as quickly as possible to the officers in charge. But he stated unequivocally that he had approved the Manitoba projects. That, Madam Speaker, is the main issue, I believe: the projects were approved even though the hon. member claimed they were not.