

Privilege—Mr. Domm

ministry in question, at that time he responded to my charges on the question of privilege after three or four members had spoken it. I stand to be corrected on the numbers.

At that time the minister admitted that maybe there was a mistake made. He also said he would look into my question of privilege. I supplied all my documents and all the foundation for argument to the Chair through *Hansard*. That is recorded in *Hansard* of July 3, when I rose on the question of privilege.

My concerns at this time, as a result of the minister rising on this question of privilege, are twofold. First, I would ask the Chair if it is customary that debate can follow while the Speaker of the House is deliberating on the motion I proposed, namely that this matter of discriminatory treatment of members of Parliament by the Department of Secretary of State through the issuance of false documents to me by the department and through the misuse of the citizenship courts for political purposes, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

If Your Honour should decide that the minister may again bring the subject up in the form of debate with new information of further elaboration on statements already made, then I would request that the eight or nine members who spoke to this question on July 3 be given the same opportunity. This would allow all members of the House to be treated equally and to elaborate further on the statements they gave or present any new information that might have come to their attention as a result of my question of privilege.

Despite the fact that this is an opposition day and that I would not like to see the time diluted by further debate on this subject while we are awaiting the Chair's decision, I suggest that as there obviously is to be debate, as evidenced by the minister offering further information, then that is all the more reason my question of privilege claiming that there are two classes of members of Parliament in this House be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. At that time any member of the House could present any information that might assist the Chair in determining whether I have a legitimate question of privilege. I think one speech should be sufficient to cover the point in question.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. For the information of the hon. member, one day last week the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) was not in the House and the next day the minister was not in the House, so we need a bit of co-ordination here. At one point the minister said in reply to the question of privilege that he would like to bring forward some information to the attention of the House on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Peterborough. The hon. member was not in the House at the time the minister wanted to make a statement and bring that information forward, so the House agreed that it would allow the information to be given to the House when the hon. member for Peterborough was present so that, if need be, he could reply to the information. The idea was that the minister would very briefly give the information which he had promised to bring to the House and the hon. member for Peterborough would be

allowed to reply briefly if he wished, and that would end the interventions allowed on this question of privilege.

I am ready to rule and I only delayed my ruling, as I did for the question of privilege brought forward by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), because there might have been some similarity. At any rate, I wanted to rule on both at the same time. I am in the hands of the House. If the House still wants to hear the minister's supplementary information, then we will hear the hon. member for Peterborough as well; otherwise I shall rule tomorrow on the question.

An hon. Member: Let us have the ruling.

Madam Speaker: The House will have to wait until tomorrow because I did not bring it with me. I shall rule tomorrow and that will save time for opposition day. However, as agreed the other day, the House now does not want the hon. member to make a further statement?

An hon. Member: That is correct.

Madam Speaker: That is correct.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): On the point of order raised by the hon. member for Peterborough, Madam Speaker, there are two points to be drawn to the attention of the Chair. When the minister who now seeks the floor rose and the hon. member for Peterborough was not in his place, that was subsequent to the time the original question of privilege was raised. The minister had already spoken on the question of privilege. On a subsequent day, he then rose seeking to elaborate on his existing contribution to that question of privilege.

● (1510)

Since you have been in the Chair, Madam Speaker, you have been in the custom of hearing members only once on a question of privilege. If you hear the minister twice on this same question, I submit that any member can be heard twice on the same question, and that should be incorporated in your ruling, if you hear the minister now.

Madam Speaker: Indeed, that is quite correct. I did say that I would not allow the hon. minister to make a statement unless the House agreed, and the House did agree.

The minister had said the following in his intervention when the question of privilege was raised: "I am more than willing to look into the matter and bring back to this House this further information".

I am quoting from *Hansard*. However, if the House now does not want to hear the hon. minister, I am in the hands of the House and I will not allow the minister to bring forward that supplementary information. It is quite clear that a member cannot speak twice on a question of privilege.

Mr. Fox: Madam Speaker, very briefly I have two points. First, all I was interested in was to bring the facts to the attention of the House to clear up the issue.