

Privilege—Mr. Domm

am sure are being followed. I then found the same thing was happening to me as a Member of Parliament in the carrying out of my responsibilities and presenting the other side of this forced march to metric being experienced in Canada.

Before quoting from Beauchesne, I wish to place on the record and for your consideration exactly what happened in the last 30 days which causes me to appeal to the Chair for consideration in reviewing this matter.

I was invited to appear on the Jack Webster show in British Columbia on February 10. I was asked questions by phone-in listeners and was interviewed by the MC. I dealt with the matter of the Metric Commission and its attitude with regard to the implementation in the retail food sector. It was not enough that I appeared on that show to answer questions and to present evidence, but on returning here—

Madam Speaker: Order. I would like the hon. member to state his questions of privilege. Up until now he has been debating. He is probably not very happy with the application by the Metric Commission. That is a matter for debate in the House, not a question of privilege. The hon. member will have to indicate to me very soon where his question of privilege lies.

Mr. Domm: The prima facie case I wish to make deals with this 33-page document put out to discredit a Member of Parliament by the executive director of Metric Canada. It is the method by which this document has been entered into the records to which I take objection. I feel it is a discredit to the executive director, endangers my position, hampers my ability and discredits a Member of Parliament. If that is not a question of privilege, then I beg you to bear with me as I point out some of the concerns.

It is the responsibility of a Member of Parliament to interpret matters as he or she sees them. It is not the responsibility of a senior bureaucrat to throw harassment in the face of debate. I object to the way in which this was done.

The executive director of the Metric Commission, who comes under the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, produced a 33-page transcript, purchased a tape from the Jack Webster show at a cost of \$425, called in the staff of the Metric Commission to a closed meeting, to which I was not invited or of which I was not advised, and reviewed with them false statements and facts with regard to the implementation of metric. He brainwashed those people in the Metric Commission with regard to what is going on and discredited a Member of Parliament with regard to his duties and responsibilities to interpret legislation and regulations.

I wish to read into the record from the statement of the Professional Institute of Public Servants, which appeared in the January 23 edition of the Ottawa *Citizen*, in support of my prima facie case of privilege affecting my responsibilities as a member of Parliament. It not only affects every member of this House but it affects also the civil service through union action by their leaders because of intimidation and harassment by the executive director of the Metric Commission.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member need not read these quotations unless he is talking about something related to the proceedings in the House. A question of privilege does not cover the kind of grievance the hon. member is now airing before the House—definitely not. There is nothing to indicate a question of privilege in anything the hon. member has said up until now. I will now not allow him to quote at length from documents he has not yet identified. The Chair is unable to know what document he is talking about or indeed what documents appear to be a harassment and impede him in his function as a Member of Parliament. The hon. member must relate to what constitutes a question of privilege. A question of privilege cannot be used to air differences of opinions or grievances about the way the government conducts its business. There are other occasions to do that through other proceedings in the House. A question of privilege is not one of them.

Mr. Domm: I will move on and refer the Chair to Erskine May, page 147, where the following is stated:

Acts tending indirectly to obstruct members in the discharge of their duty.

Conduct not amounting to a direct attempt to influence a Member in the discharge of his duties, but having a tendency to impair his independence in the future performance of his duty, will also be treated as a breach of privilege.

—Molestation of Members on Account of Their Conduct in Parliament—It is a breach of privilege to molest any member of either House on account of his conduct in Parliament.

Madam Speaker: Order. Has the hon. member been molested or prevented in any way? The hon. member has to make that argument, otherwise it takes ten or 15 minutes before we know whether there is a foundation for a question of privilege. Hon. members must go directly to the core of the matter. I know these quotations from Erskine May and I can refer to them when making a judgment on a question of privilege. They need not be read into the record at this particular time.

• (2100)

Mr. Domm: With all due respect, Madam Speaker, it says in here at page 147:

Sending insulting letters to members in reference to their conduct in Parliament or letters reflecting on their conduct as such members—

If that is in fact an obstruction of a member's duties, then I must ask the Speaker of the House whether she will not consider these points prior to referring specifically to the statements that have been made. I am trying to give some of the background and reasoning. I would go to page 13, Citation 22 of Beauchesne, which states:

The power of the House to enforce its rules extends not only to Members and others admitted within the precincts of Parliament, but also to members of the general public who may interfere with the orderly conduct of parliamentary business.

I would like to inject here another passage from the proceedings in a case of "Breach of Privilege and Contempts" at page 148:

"Written imputations, as affecting a Member of Parliament, may amount to breach of privilege, without, perhaps, being libels at common law" (b), but to constitute a breach of privilege of libel upon a member must concern the character or conduct of the member in that capacity—