

Privilege

himself, that I have ever heard, as the Prime Minister Ret., even though at one point he did hold that position.

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt the hon. member for a moment. Not to take anything away from the cogency of his argument, but the hon. member is inviting the Chair to look at three different definitions of the abbreviation.

I have to say that unless there was some very cogent evidence indeed, I would take the view that that meant retired, unless the hon. member has some other strong argument. The difficulty again is that I would like the hon. member to stick to the basic story. Then what I have to decide eventually is if there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence to put the very kind of question to a committee. Hon. members will realize that it is not the place of the Speaker to delve into all the intricacies of what might eventually be a proposition of evidence or an argument on it.

• (1510)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, let me move on to the next point that I want to bring to the attention of the Chairman.

First of all, Your Honour will recall that on May 6, 1985 there was a case which was decided upon by Mr. Speaker at that time, wherein an ad had been placed in a newspaper in Toronto by someone acting on behalf of another individual who no longer was a member of Parliament. About this particular ad the Chairman ruled—I read from Hansard of May 6, 1985 at page 4439:

It should go without saying that a Member of Parliament needs to perform his function effectively and that anything tending to cause confusion as to a Member's identity, creates the possibility of an impediment to the fulfilment of that Member's functions.

If that argument applies to a member of Parliament individually, then I suggest that it apply similarly to the House collectively. I read further from Mr. Speaker's decision at that time:

Any action which impedes or tends to impede a Member in the discharge of his duties is a breach of privilege.

That was the decision with regard to that case, which was ruled on by Mr. Speaker on May 6, 1985.

I want to bring two more matters, very quickly, to the attention of the Chairman. First, Section 80 of the Parliament of Canada Act makes it against the rules for anyone to call any kind of a business establishment "Parliament Hill", the implication being that you cannot

associate something with this Parliament when it does not have anything to do with this Parliament.

By extension, the group in the United States, by utilizing the material in question for promotional purposes in that country, I would suggest what it is doing is inappropriate.

There are two more issues that I want to bring to your attention. One is the fact that a spokesperson, acting on behalf of English First, stated with regard to the use of the title block that I have just described, and the signature of the former MP in the following way: "It certainly gets the point across that this is a legitimate Canadian spokesman who has an important message."

Even the people who put this message together in the United States were doing so to let people believe that someone in Canada in an office of authority was responsible for getting this message across.

When information is disseminated in this manner, either in Canada or abroad, by someone who is not a member of Parliament but who is, as he described himself in one section of the letter, "Member of Parliament, Ret.", or if one looks at the letterhead—granted, some people have admitted that they superimposed this—the implication is that this House or a member of this House either, while in office or after being out of office but still with the use of the letterhead and therefore claiming to have something to do with this institution, then I believe that all the privileges of members of Parliament and this House have been affected by what has happened.

There is a further matter, and that is the matter of the envelope in question that was utilized, wherein the Coat of Arms of Canada was employed without the inscription "House of Commons." That could be an issue involving the law rather than this House, so I will not discuss it any further except to state that I hope that the Secretary of State, who is responsible for the keeping of the Coat of Arms of Canada, will address that issue, because after all, he is the custodian of it.

Also, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs should be made aware of the provisions of the Trade-marks Act, which prevents the utilization of our Coat of Arms for anything else than official government purposes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to express to you that if you deem that there is a *prima facie* case of privilege in this case, with the information that I brought