

could not. I did not have \$425, but obviously the Metric Commission does.

**An hon. Member:** The taxpayers do.

**Mr. Domm:** The taxpayers do. After I had sent two letters to the Metric Commission and a message by courier service to Mr. Boire personally, he sent the tape over for my observation. He also sent the document I have in my hand. This 33-page document has travelled coast to coast. I had a conversation today with the people who attended the meeting in Vancouver this past weekend, the retail trades sector of the Metric Commission, I was in conversation with a member of the voluntary group of this working retail trade sector of the Metric Commission. Just tonight I learned, as best I can recall, that he was advised by the Metric Commission that I had a poor researcher and that the information I was spreading across Canada about this forced march to metric in the retail food sector was improperly researched and inaccurately accounted. If this is travelling to Vancouver, then in my opinion it is clearly and simply a question of privilege. Can a senior bureaucrat in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce go about his function, with the bureaucracy he has around him and with a \$6.5 million annual budget, discrediting a Member of Parliament?

Let me read the letter he wrote to me. It reads as follows:

I regret that I was not able to respond to your request of 1981-02-07 before now. Since your original request was received, the MCC Information staff members have been preparing a detailed commentary on your remarks in order to assist you—

This is the executive director of the Metric Commission telling me that he is going to assist me in being as factual as possible in my future interviews across Canada. As Speaker of this House, you must give serious consideration to my question of privilege.

● (2120)

There is a prepared brief, and I am tabling it for your information, entitled, "Public Service Union Requests Probe of Harassment by the Executive Director of the Metric Commission." Harassment of the professional institute. I will just read one paragraph:

Boire organizes an annual two day staff meeting at the RA Centre. Consists of officers from the four directorates and admin. services—includes CO's, information officers and admin. officer (A.S.). About 40 attend. There is simultaneous translation, free booze one evening. Simultaneous translation alone cost \$2,000 though none of the staff asked for it. Boire organizes and orchestrates the whole show, although he states that staff do it. Boire picks the venue, the date, the subject matter to be discussed.

It must be obvious to everyone here that we have the professional institute laying a charge of harassment. We have clearly and precisely demonstrated tonight that I have been harassed in my area of responsibility as I scrutinized the Metric Commission and the regulations through statements made on the Jack Webster show. It is obvious to this House that precedents have been set for consideration of a privilege where written documents have clearly shown that a member's function has been curtailed or hampered, and the executive

*Privilege—Mr. Domm*

director of the Metric Commission is clearly and simply creating an atmosphere of distrust in Members of Parliament through his actions. It is bad enough that we have to fight these things by appealing to the compassion of the Chair, but it is really sad that Industry, Trade and Commerce will set up a bureaucracy and spend between \$6 and \$8 million a year to expound on the virtues of metric, and then spend X-thousands of dollars to discredit a Member of Parliament as he tries to delve into the justification for forced metric conversion in the retail food sector.

I really feel that if the opportunity were given to each Member of Parliament to properly represent his constituents in the various areas of Canada, whether in the agricultural, business or industrial communities, I think we would be better off if we did not have a Metric Commission. If we have to have one, it could be on a voluntary basis, truly representative of the people's concerns as they march toward forced implementation of metric conversion in the retail food sector.

I do not wish to debate at this time the pros and cons of metric conversion. I am debating the privileges of a Member of Parliament, and I appeal to the Chair to refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections so that I can debate this subject there and present far greater evidence than I have tonight. I could have read the whole 33 pages, but I thought seven of the items in question would be enough so that you would graciously rule there is a prima facie case of privilege and you would refer it to the committee as quickly as possible.

So I would like to move that the actions of the executive director of the Metric Commission, Mr. P. C. Boire, which actions have obstructed me in the discharge of my responsibility, be referred to the committee so that we can show the facts of the case in more detail.

**Madam Speaker:** The hon. member has quoted extensively from a document which I am sure would be very helpful if he would leave it with me. I will want to look at his argument in light of that document, and I will take his question of privilege under advisement.

Now, we have a second question of privilege from the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm).

MR. DOMM—RELOCATION OF PARKS CANADA OFFICE—  
ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS BY MINISTER OF THE  
ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, I am sure this will take far less time because it is far easier to get to the point on this question of privilege because your rulings have led me to where I am tonight after almost one year of frustration in trying to deal with statements in this House by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts) and his parliamentary secretary. If you will bear with me, I will go back to the statement that was made in this House by the hon. member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons), which caused you to rule later on a question of privilege, that if I wished to pursue this matter of the Parks Canada move from Peterbor-