

Privilege—Mr. Domm

House by rating members of Parliament who sit on the government side of the House as being in possession of more rights and privileges than hon. members who sit on the opposition side. It is a clear example of indulging in discrimination against hon. members on this side so that their duties are therefore interfered with and impeded when it comes to performing them.

In a ruling which you, Madam Speaker, made yesterday you declared, as recorded at page 2502 of *Hansard*:

A member's privilege is usually an action of some nature which prevents him from fulfilling his duties as a member.

I believe the meaning of your statement is very clear indeed and, if applied to the remarks made to us this afternoon and the case placed before us by the hon. member for Peterborough, I think it clearly reveals a case of his being prevented, to use Your Honour's words, "from fulfilling his duties as a member".

I think one of the customary and accepted duties of a member of Parliament, as mentioned by my colleague, is to welcome new Canadians who take out citizenship to his riding. That is a privilege we have all had. It is a privilege which has been extended to us by various governments over the years, and it has been withdrawn from one particular member of this House and, for that matter, perhaps others about whom we do not know.

In this case, for example, the hon. member has been told that there are no names or addresses because no one received citizenship. Then, if I understood the hon. member correctly, he managed to obtain a list of names. I naturally agree that they would be useless without addresses accompanying them. Then to recover from embarrassment over what happened in the House yesterday, some person, who must obviously have been dispatched by the office of the Secretary of State or someone acting on behalf of that office, sneakily, surreptitiously and in a somewhat slovenly way shoved under the door of the office of the hon. member for Peterborough the list of names and addresses which the government had previously declared to be non-existent. All of a sudden, after he mentioned this in the House yesterday, within a very few hours they appeared, shoved under his door.

● (1520)

This can scarcely be considered as anything else but a breach of the privileges of the hon. member for Peterborough and, indirectly, a breach of privilege of all members of the House who must be deeply concerned that such a thing has happened. It is another case of shockingly conclusive proof that the government, in a contemptuous fashion, is interfering with our privileges to carry out properly our duties.

I trust, Madam Speaker, that you will rule in a way to put an end to this disgusting charade that the government is carrying on. My colleague, the hon. member for Peterborough, has cited many of the background precedents to illustrate what is a clearcut breach of privilege. I hope that you will rule, as I said, to end the charade being committed by this government, which is definitely interfering with the rights of this particular

member and of others to perform their duties as such, and again I am paraphrasing the words which you yourself gave in the ruling of yesterday.

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, it was my intention to rise on a separate question of privilege on a matter that concerns me, but I think perhaps my remarks are appropriate on the question raised now by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm).

It seems to me that the question he raised, as well as the questions which have been raised in the immediate past, go to the heart, at least in my understanding, of what are the rights and privileges of members. Surely if these rights and privileges are extended to all members, they must be equal. I can put no other interpretation on the words "rights and privileges of members". That does not mean "some" members; presumably it means, or should mean, "all" members. That is why I was very happy yesterday when I heard your ruling, and indeed read it again in *Hansard*, in which you indicated that in future it will amount to an appropriate question of privilege when an action involves the stopping of a member from fulfilling his duties as a member. That is why, Madam Speaker, I recognize that I should not deal with the matter which was before the House in a motion under Standing Order 43, but it is in the spirit of your own ruling that I presented a motion that all members should be treated equally when it comes to the administration of New Horizons programs.

I have some difficulty with respect to where I stand as a member because it is now the House which has said in its majority that members are equal in the administration of that program; but Liberal members have said no to that. They said that members are not equal in the administration of that program and, presumably, that means of other programs.

I would like to know and I think all members need to know whether or not those in the minority in the House have less rights than members who are in the majority party. Clearly my rights as the member for Rosedale cannot be less than those of the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae), who seconded my motion, or indeed of the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan). Clearly that cannot be true. The hon. member for York Centre cannot have more rights than the hon. member for Rosedale or the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood; it is not possible. If that is true, then we have a difficulty. We now have the knot in the chain, if I recall the words of another hon. member. The difficulty we have is that, that action having been taken, I do not know what my rights are in relation to the general rights of all members. I think they should be equal.

That is why, rather than raise the question myself, I hope that the motion presented by the hon. member for Peterborough will go to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, because I do not know how else to explain to the people I represent that my rights and privileges as a member representing their interests are not equal to those of members in the Liberal party. That is unacceptable. I hope, therefore, that in moving the matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections we will at least be dealing with the