

Madam Speaker: Would the hon. member tell us what edition he is reading from because we cannot find the references to which he is referring?

Mr. Domm: It is in respect of "Breaches of Privilege and Contempts" at page 148 of *Beauchesne*. It is in that part dealing with "Complaints Against Strangers Founded Upon Documents." It is at page 159 and is "Proceedings in Case of Contempt."

Madam Speaker: I thought the hon. member was reading from *Erskine May*. He is now suggesting he is quoting from *Beauchesne*. If it is *Erskine May*, which I think it is because the pages given to me do not relate at all to *Beauchesne*, will he tell us what edition, because even there it is difficult for us to find.

Mr. Domm: I apologize, Madam Speaker. I am referring to pages 147, 148 and 159 of *Erskine May*, nineteenth edition.

Madam Speaker: It is edition eighteen, not nineteen.

Mr. Domm: At page 159 it states:

When complaint is made of something published in a newspaper or book, a copy of the newspaper or book, and when complaint is made of a letter sent to a member, the original of the letter said to have been written, must be delivered in at the table—

I am presenting that now as evidence and I will give you examples from this article, letter or document which clearly reflect a question of privilege and a move of harassment against a Member of Parliament.

In this particular document entitled "Bill Domm/Jack Webster Interview February 10, 1981" printed by the Metric Commission of Canada comprising 33 pages I will refer to four instances which I consider clear and simple harassment, misrepresentation of the facts by the executive director of the Metric Commission in an effort to discredit disparagingly the remarks of a Member of Parliament made in the performance of his duty as a Member of Parliament.

On the Jack Webster show I made this statement and it is quoted in here according to the executive director:

He went into a creative study for one year in which they would look at the implementations of metric and the ratifications of it. The net result of that study was that we weren't ready to proceed.

That was my statement. The Metric Commission responded to that statement by saying:

They indicate that the majority of Canadians understand metric units and the desirability of the objectives, and accept the use of the International System of Units in their daily lives.

That is not true. There are ample indications that he is misleading the people and is refuting a statement I made that is fact based on a test centre in Peterborough. There are ample surveys to indicate that my information is true while his is not, and this is an effort to discredit a Member of Parliament.

It is not bad enough that he takes this upon himself in his capacity as a senior bureaucrat, discrediting a Member of Parliament, the seriousness of this is that he does it behind closed doors with civil servants who have already charged him

Privilege—Mr. Domm

with harassment, as I referred to earlier in my remarks, namely, the Professional Institute of the Public Service. The staff is angry with him, Members of Parliament are angry with him and he is clearly and simply harassing us in our responsibility as we try to interpret what this Metric Commission is doing.

The second area in which he has clearly and plainly harassed a Member of Parliament is to be found in these words:

—whereas in Peterborough all but three (67 out of 70) stores converted back to selling by the pound.

In other words, he is saying there are three stores in Peterborough which are still using metric. That is not true.

These are the facts. In my riding of Peterborough I do not know of one store that does not show the price per pound of the food they sell, and I invite and challenge the Metric Commission and its executive director to inform me of the names of those three stores which do not print on the wall the price per pound of every pound or ounce of meat or goods they sell.

At page 8 of this same document it proceeds to harass and discredit, a Member of Parliament throwing a disparaging light on him. We find this statement made by the Metric Commission to this closed group:

—Statute Law (Metric Conversion) Amendment Act, 1976... was debated in Parliament over a period of nine months,

That is what it says in answer to my statement that metric is being forced on the people of Canada through order in council. My answer to that was that:

This is a particularly gratuitous example of the MCC distorting the statutory and regulatory basis for enforced conversion.

It gives the impression that Parliament debated the bill exclusively for nine months—

That is not true.

At page 9 of this same document we find another statement. I might add that the Metric Commission engaged a lawyer at \$250 a day for seven days to come up with these brilliant answers. The Metric Commission says that a Dominion Stores' survey in Peterborough in January, 1980, showed that some negative attitudes prevailed. A Steinberg survey in Sherbrooke revealed a different position. In a way, the Metric Commission said, it would appear that the surveys and stores' interpretation of the results may have reflected the attitudes of the stores at that time rather than the customers' attitudes.

● (2110)

The truth of the matter is that the Metric Commission of Canada has also been particularly keen on maintaining that scale conversion is a program which will be instituted in close co-operation with the retail food industry, the very sector it condemns in this attempt to mitigate the adverse results of the Dominion and Steinberg surveys.

On the same page, page 9, the Metric Commission says:

Of the top thousand... manufacturing companies in that country, more than 60 per cent are converting to the metric system.