

that I should like to present to Your Honour before you make your ruling.

An hon. Member: Where did you get it, South Africa?

Madam Speaker: I take that representation very seriously but, as I said before, when the first speaker does not convince me that there is a prima facie case of privilege, I have the tendency not to listen to a second one.

Mr. Crosbie: Maybe I would be more persuasive, Madam Speaker.

An hon. Member: Impossible!

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Madam Speaker: I do not doubt that the hon. member could be—

Mr. Crosbie: I wonder, Madam Speaker, could you give me a try?

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether that advice was partial or impartial, surely the hon. member for York-Peel does not expect the Chair to adjudicate that. That is not a matter on which the Chair can make any kind of pronouncement at all.

He also contends that the rebuttal which was tabled in the House by the minister, the Kershaw report, was one-sided. That might be, but am I to judge that document? I will not even say whether it is normal or not that a minister of the Crown, wanting to defend the position of the government, is quite legitimately capable of expressing an opinion in this House.

When and if we discuss the resolution, I am sure the hon. member will be able to give his own opinion about the Kershaw report. That is normal debate in the House of Commons and, therefore, I do not think the fact that that document, in the opinion of the hon. member, is one-sided, constitutes a reason for me to see a prima facie case of privilege.

He says that his words are mild compared to other words, when I cautioned him not to cast any kind of reflection on members of the House, and he quoted some other words which were not judged unparliamentary but he was speaking in terms of unparliamentary language. He says his words were rather mild.

I want to remind the hon. member that he can express opinions in this House, even very strongly, so long as he does so in parliamentary language. Opinions may be expressed, but if the hon. member wants the House to judge the action or the conduct of a minister in the House, the only way he can achieve that is by bringing forward a motion on which the House will pronounce itself. If the hon. member wants the House to judge what the hon. Minister of Justice has done in regard to advice he has given concerning the resolution on the Constitution, he would have to do it in another way.

Privilege—Mr. Domm

The hon. member quoted the requirements of the office of the attorney general in the United Kingdom. He quoted some documents from the United Kingdom describing what the requirements of the attorney general are. I believe that the quotations referred to legal advice which the attorney general would give about a prosecution. If he were giving advice about a prosecution, he would have to be impartial and conform with all the requirements which the hon. member referred to in this document.

This is really not grounds for a question of privilege, and I did not find, in the argumentation brought forward by the hon. member, which he made very carefully and to which I listened very carefully, that there is a question of privilege in this particular case.

I have another question of privilege in the name of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm).

MR. DOMM—ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF METRIC COMMISSION OF CANADA

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Madam Speaker, I delivered to your office this morning before the hour of one o'clock, two letters on two questions of privilege which I wish to bring up. I will bring up one now dealing with the matter of the executive director of the Metric Commission of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (2050)

Mr. Domm: If you should find that I have a prima facie case, I should like to move:

That the actions of the executive director of the Metric Commission, Mr. P. C. Boire, have obstructed me in the discharge of my responsibilities and that his actions be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I will endeavour to show you this evening, in as few words as possible, how the executive director has clearly overstepped the mark of propriety. He has hampered me in my ability as a Member of Parliament to function in a responsible manner. He has attempted to create an atmosphere of fear and thus created a climate of mistrust. This situation has made it very difficult for me as a Member of Parliament to pursue my responsibilities, not only to this House, but to my constituents. I cannot point out as a member of the opposition exactly what we are getting into through this dictatorial attitude of harassment on the part of the executive director of the Metric Commission.

I will be quoting from Beauchesne, Erskine May and other precedents to indicate to you why the situation deserves reference to the privileges and elections committee. If I had been the first to raise this matter of harassment, I would have some reservations about doing so when we are dealing with something as important as the Constitution of Canada. However, in the Friday, January 23, edition of the *Ottawa Citizen*, it was pointed out that the Professional Institute of Public Servants laid a charge of harassment against the executive director of the Metric Commission. At the time I passed over this, waiting for a decision to be made through the proper channels, which I