

Privilege—Mr. Domm

ough back to Cornwall, I had ample opportunity to do that. On page 1014 of *Hansard* of May 13, 1980, Madam Speaker, you said:

The hon. member, if he is still not satisfied with the explanation that he has received, might, for instance, put a notice of motion on the order paper . . . There are also procedures to obtain those documents, under certain conditions, of course. But if those conditions are met and the minister is capable of tabling those documents, I suppose that they could be obtained through the normal procedure.

I followed all your recommendations, starting first on May 12, 1980, when the hon. member for Burin-St. George's said:

—it was the administration of which he was a part—

“He” being myself when we were in government:

—which deferred the move for ten whole months—ten painful months for the people of Canada?

That was the first statement by the hon. member for Burin-St. George's that I challenged through a question of privilege in this House. On May 13, 1980, at page 1012, the hon. member for Burin-St. George's said:

The hon. member quotes me correctly. It is my understanding based on information that was given to me—I was not here at the time as hon. members are aware.

● (2130)

Also the hon. member for Burin-St. George's said:

I am saying to the hon. member for Peterborough that he did quote me correctly. The hon. member reads *Hansard* well. The statements which I made last night were made on the basis of information with which I have been supplied. I would be pleased to make that information available to the hon. member and, in so far as I know at this moment in time, the information is correct. It was given to me by senior departmental officials—

That is the key, Madam Speaker. He continued:

—and until I have been shown otherwise I will stand by that information.

I questioned that information, and Madam Speaker's ruling was that I had a course open to me—I could ask for the production of documents. I did that, and then on November 25, 1980, as reported at page 5081 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Burin-St. George's said:

—I made no commitment to him.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I am just warning the hon. member that he might talk himself out of a question of privilege. A question of privilege and the facts relating to it must be brought to the attention of the House on the earliest possible occasion. The hon. member is referring to matters which took place on May 12, 1980, and on May 13, 1980, which is a long time ago. If the hon. member has been aggrieved by any of these occurrences, he should have brought them before the House much earlier.

If he continues to go back into history, he will have talked himself out of his question of privilege. I urge him to come closer to the event which aggrieves him so that I can understand his question of privilege.

Mr. Domm: Madam Speaker, I will bring you right up to February, 1981. I need to give the background information in order to give the facts on the question of privilege.

Madam Speaker: No, no. The hon. member should state now, quite clearly, his question of privilege, to what particular circumstances he attaches it and then, if he wants, in the course of his argument he can make some other references to earlier events. Then perhaps I could entertain it. But just now he must come directly to the question of privilege.

Mr. Domm: If Madam Speaker feels I have a prima facie question of privilege, I would move that this Parliament has been misled by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts) in the production of documents under Order No. 27 of November 20, 1980, at which time at your suggestion I called for the production of papers which were offered to me by the hon. member for Burin-St. George's to prove his point. At your suggestion, I called for the production of papers because he volunteered those, if required.

I called for the production of papers. Finally the Minister of the Environment answered that call this year. I feel I have a question of privilege because in the production of the documents to substantiate the statements of the hon. member for Burin-St. George's, they produced the speech of the hon. member for Burin-St. George's but no confirmation of any senior official or no direction from any of the deputy assistants of the Department of the Environment. It was just a copy of his speech in the late show debate. I feel this House was misled when they produced documents which were not what was called for and what they were committed to produce.

I refer to page 178, the fourth paragraph of Citation 212 of Beauchesne's fourth edition wherein it reads:

The addition of particulars to a return, not specified in the order of the House of Commons, has been ruled by Mr. Speaker to be an irregularity.

When they produced a document to substantiate the claim that it was the Conservative government of the day which deferred the move of Parks Canada, when in reality it was the present government which deferred the move, they produce a false document. The document does not give any substantiating evidence whatsoever to the fact that it was the Conservative government which deferred the move of Parks Canada.

I have the announcement of the Conservative government which clearly indicated that the hon. member for Peterborough announced, on behalf of the then minister responsible for Parks Canada, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), that the Ontario regional office of Parks Canada would be moved to Peterborough during the summer of 1980.

For the hon. member for Burin-St. George's to say that it was our government which deferred the move and that it was their government which took action is truly false. The Minister of the Environment undertook to produce a document to substantiate that, but it in no way substantiates it.

Order No. 27 reads as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, notes, transcripts and all other communications exchanged between the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment and senior departmental officials cited by the Parliamentary Secretary in the House on May 13, 1980—

The wrong document was produced. It is not the right information; it does not substantiate the statement. Your