

would raise a question of privilege on Tuesday in the House, but the Hon. Member was in the House yesterday. He ought to have raised his question of privilege at the first opportunity. I will not hold that against the Hon. Member, but I do remind him that, technically speaking, it should have been raised yesterday.

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss a breach of my privileges as a member of the House as it relates to a letter forwarded to my office, written by Commissioner Cleo Mowers, a metric commissioner employed by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and appointed by Order in Council.

I will endeavour to show you, Madam Speaker, in as few words as possible, how this metric commissioner has clearly overstepped the mark of propriety. He has hampered my ability as a Member of Parliament to function in a responsible manner. He has attempted to create an atmosphere of fear and thus has created a climate of mistrust. The situation has made it very difficult for me as a Member of Parliament to pursue my responsibilities not only in this House but to my constituents as an extension of my duties in this House.

Beyond this indignity, Mr. Mowers has the audacity to call into question the integrity of Government Cabinet Ministers, and even of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of Canada. For the benefit of the Chair I will supply the full content of Mr. Mower's letter to the Prime Minister and to many of my colleagues here in this House, as well as to members of the Senate.

**Madam Speaker:** It would be more useful in the particular proceedings that we are going through if the Hon. Member sent a copy of that document to the Chair, because the Chair would not be able to judge this question of privilege unless it had the full documents to which the Hon. Member is referring.

**Mr. Domm:** I realize that, Madam Speaker. That is why I referred specifically to the letter in my communication to you last week, referring to excerpts from the letter in order that you may be apprised of the seriousness of the letter.

I am personally appalled at the lack of respect exhibited by this individual on the Metric Commission. By the way, he is paid \$250 a day as a public servant in the Metric Commission serving as a commissioner. He drastically exceeds his mandate and his oath of office, which I have here and which I will also be tabling, by instructing not only myself as a Member of Parliament but also the Government of this country.

We are not dealing in this case with a private citizen, nor am I questioning a private citizen's freedom of speech. We are, however, dealing with a public servant whose words and actions carry the authority of his office. When Parliament first established the Metric Commission, its purpose was to facilitate the conversion process and not to throw into question the integrity of Members of Parliament, the Cabinet or the Prime Minister.

The prima facie case I wish to make deals with a letter circulated to my colleagues which discredits elected Members

*Privilege—Mr. Domm*

of Parliament and seriously impedes their ability effectively to discharge their duties. It is the responsibility of a Member of Parliament to interpret matters as he or she sees them. It is definitely not the responsibility of a metric commissioner to practise overt acts of harassment. I strongly object to the manner in which this was done.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I can see from the presentation of the Hon. Member, which has now gone on for five minutes, that he is aggrieved by an action of a public servant who has obviously criticized what the Hon. Member has said outside the House. The Hon. Member may be considerably aggrieved by that, but it certainly does not constitute a question of privilege. The Hon. Member will have to demonstrate to me very soon that he has been impeded in his function as a Member of Parliament and that that is the basis of his question of privilege. Otherwise, I will have to cut him off and decide that he does not have a question of privilege.

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, I will respect your wishes and deal precisely with the two points you have asked me to deal with; first, exactly what this person said and, second, the precedents in rules and procedures both in Beauchesne and other references which makes this a very definite question of privilege, as determined in my research with the Parliamentary Library and other authorities on the Hill.

I would like to quote from Mr. Mowers' letter to give the obvious indication of where I feel I have a question of privilege. In his letter to the Prime Minister, referring to Cabinet Ministers and Members of Parliament Mr. Mowers said, and I quote:

As a member of the Metric Commission I was appalled at the vast distortion of metric facts in news stories, editorials, and letters to the editor, most inspired by or emanating from the office of Bill Domm, M.P.

I am trying to make this brief by quoting only three paragraphs of a rather lengthy letter. There will be opportunity for yourself and the Table to review it Madam Speaker. I quote:

I wrote a couple of hundred original letters to editors correcting the record and inferentially questioning Domm's truthfulness, until finally both his voice and his credibility are now much weakened.

In addition, I refer the House to Mr. Mowers' remarks regarding the governing Party. I will quote for their interest and Your Honour's consideration:

The impression is abroad that the Government doesn't listen to the people. To the extent it is true, these are the faults: (a) the ultimate decision-makers are too few, too obscure, too elusive; (b) those in authority are held in protective custody of their staffs; (c)—

**Madam Speaker:** Order. The Hon. Member is debating. Just because a bureaucrat does not agree with the Hon. Member or is criticizing some Members of the Government, or other people, does not constitute a question of privilege. The Hon. Member will have to tell me right away where his question of privilege lies.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Madam Speaker, may I intervene just briefly at this point. I heard the Hon. Member say two things which I think deserves the attention of the Chair in coming to a