

Privilege—Mr. Fox

while we were discussing the question of privilege upon which you have just ruled, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) made a statement which to my mind raises a new question of privilege on my part. In the course of that debate he indicated he would have been given false documents by the minister himself, by myself. Madam Speaker, I would like to reserve or have clarification on the point—

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. The hon. member for Peterborough is attempting to catch your eye to raise a point of order to correct *Hansard* to dispose of the matter which has been raised by the minister, thus saving the time of the House.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. All I want to do is to make quite clear how I am handling this matter. The hon. member for Peterborough rose on a point of order. I asked him whether that point of order arose from the deliberations we had just concluded. He did not answer; he sat down again. Previous to that I had recognized the Secretary of State so I did, quite correctly, I think, go back to the Secretary of State. I must hear the Secretary of State and I would be delighted to hear the hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Domm: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker, pertaining to this very matter. I did nod my head, Madam Speaker, and I apologize for not being more vocal in my interests on my point of order.

My point of order stems directly from the notice given by the minister arising from the discussion here today, and that is that yesterday in this House the minister indicated that he intended to rise, perhaps, on this question of privilege. The point of order is this. At the top of page 2856 of *Hansard* yesterday the word "minister" appears and I would ask that it be changed to "ministry". It further goes on to explain in the third paragraph, as I detail the explanation, that it is the ministry which is in question, not the minister, as explained in the third paragraph where I say "namely that this matter of discriminatory treatment of members of Parliament by the Department of Secretary of State through the issuance of false documents—"

So I would ask that *Hansard* be changed to read "the ministry" instead of "the minister" at the top of page 2856, which is elaborated in the third paragraph to explain the error.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member might do well to withdraw his remarks. In my opinion it would be appropriate that he retract and apologize for having used those words, because substantially what he said in English has been well understood in the usual way we understand words in the House when he said—

[*English*]

"I had been given false documents from the minister in question".

To begin with, the question of false documents has not been established and once again the hon. member is raising the

question of false documents. He knows full well, because I told him yesterday, that of the 53 people sworn in in Peterborough on May 23, only 39 were from his riding. The Peterborough court held a swearing-in ceremony which applied to at least five federal ridings. As a matter of fact, people from any part of the country could receive their citizenship papers from the Peterborough court and the names would not be sent out to the hon. member.

The hon. member also knows that if he received a list on July 3 it was one month to the day after the previous list was sent to him on June 3, a list which was sent to him at the same time as it was sent to all members of Parliament. It is not unusual, Madam Speaker, as we all know, for members of Parliament to receive a nil report list. In the month of June, out of a total of 46 members who received nil report lists, 34 were Liberal members.

So, Madam Speaker, the type of innuendo which has been cast upon the Secretary of State Department by the hon. member is totally without foundation. Not only has the hon. member falsely accused the minister, he has also falsely accused the Secretary of State Department and I would ask him, in all decency as a parliamentarian, as a member who sits in this chamber with the rest of us, to withdraw that type of accusation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: My impression on reading *Hansard* was that perhaps the matter raised today by the minister as a question of privilege involves a slip of the tongue rather than an intention of implicating the minister. However, I would think at this point that the hon. member for Peterborough, having given his interpretation and explanation of what he saw in *Hansard*, having raised his question of privilege, and having now heard the minister on his question of privilege, might agree with me that the matter might be closed. Unless some other members wish to continue discussing this question of privilege I would feel the matter should be closed. However, I am in the hands of the House and if other hon. members wish to intervene in the debate I would, of course, have to hear them because it is a new question of privilege.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I would simply like to reserve the right to review the record concerning the statement of the Secretary of State (Mr. Fox), particularly with respect to some of the figures he cited. It may well be that upon a review of that record and in particular of the reference to the document cited "nil", a further question will arise. I would not want to lose the opportunity to raise that question in such an event.