

*Privilege—Mr. Domm*

deliberately not referred to in my statement of July 27, 1979, at which time we reversed certain decentralization moves that the previous government had put in place.

● (1530)

The proposed move resulted from a Parks Canada administration decision that its Ontario regional operations would be more efficiently handled and its clients better served from a more centrally located regional office.

Prior to 1973, the Cornwall office served as regional office for the combined Ontario and Quebec regions, and as such it was centrally located. In 1973, however, a Quebec regional office was opened in Quebec City. As Cornwall was no longer centrally located, a study was undertaken and a cabinet document prepared in 1975 proposing that the Cornwall operation be relocated in Guelph. Cabinet approved that plan but postponed that actual move.

In 1977, in order to minimize the economic impact on Cornwall, the move was postponed until the new Transport Canada training facility became operational in Cornwall.

A second study was undertaken in 1978 in collaboration with the Ontario government which resulted in the suggestion that Peterborough should be the new location. The move, however, did not go ahead at that time, and I stress that. That was the former administration's decision, notwithstanding the recommendation from the province of Ontario that the move go ahead.

In August, 1979, the minister of the environment, and my colleague from Peterborough at that time, announced that the relocation would in fact go ahead on schedule, and that was to be completed by September 1, 1980.

As a former president of the treasury board I feel that I have a duty to this House to rise and state that there has been a totally untrue allegation made. There is misinformation before the House at the present time, and I hope, Madam Speaker, that in your wisdom you will have this matter referred to the appropriate committee so that my hon. friend's position can be clarified and substantiated. It was our decision to make the move to Peterborough. We did not defer that decision. It is the present government's decision to reverse that.

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, you are being presented with two versions. On the one hand, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) and his colleagues claimed that there has been a sequence of events. On the other hand, the parliamentary secretary exposed his views; as a matter of fact, the opinions of both parties differ, and I respectfully submit that this issue should not be referred to a committee of the House and that there has been no abuse of privilege.

Madam Speaker, this is not the first time that the Progressive Conservative Party claims that it has not delayed anything, while in fact I could mention a whole series of projects which were delayed during the period that party was in power

a few months ago, and I feel that the remarks made today by the parliamentary secretary deserve consideration. What he suggested, Madam Speaker, is to verify again the previous denial. It is the hon. member for Peterborough himself who, on August 3, 1979, announced the intention of his government to postpone the move. He generously offered to check that allegation and even correct it should it turn out that the information was wrong.

I think that he is open-handed, that there is no question of privilege, that the House has enough work to do without wasting its time further and that owing to that difference of opinion, even if you could generally reject outright the question of privilege, it would perhaps be advisable to wait until tomorrow when the parliamentary secretary may provide further particulars about the matter.

*[English]*

**Madam Speaker:** The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) is obviously not satisfied with the several answers that he has received on the matter which has been brought up in this debate. He is not satisfied, and that is a legitimate complaint, of course. But I must remind him that it is a complaint.

The question which we are now debating under a question of privilege was raised originally as a question in the House and resulted in a question of privilege on which I have ruled. Then the hon. member brought the matter up in an adjournment debate of the House, and now again he has brought it up as a question of privilege.

The fact that many of the procedures used by the hon. member did not succeed in satisfying him in the answers that he has received, of course, does not automatically qualify the matter for a question of privilege. There have been several differences of opinion and attempts on both sides to try to clarify the facts, and perhaps these facts do need to be clarified further.

Members at this point have had quite a lengthy debate on the question, but it can be pursued. There are several other avenues where debate can take place in this House. The hon. member, if he is still not satisfied with the explanations that he has received, might, for instance, put a notice of motion on the order paper, he could use the supply procedure, or bring it up on one of the days which are reserved for the opposition.

There has been reference to some documents which might help to enlighten members on the question that has been debated. There are also procedures to obtain those documents, under certain conditions, of course. But if those conditions are met and the minister is capable of tabling those documents, I suppose that they could be obtained through the normal procedure.

I have already ruled, therefore, that there was no privilege in the circumstances, and unfortunately I have to rule again that there is no question of privilege at this time.