

Privilege—Mr. Boudria

whatever. It seems to me that there is still the question of regular members of the Press Gallery being there and working as supposed impartial journalists while being paid by one political Party and portraying their news reports as balanced news reports.

I hope that the Chair will look closely at this matter. It is a serious one, one that needs to be ventilated and examined at this time. This is a service which has been put forward as a service to embellish or help the Government's position while taking advantage of the word "Parliamentary" which would suggest that it is impartial and represents both sides of the House, not just the government side.

[Translation]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to what has been said. If I may, I would like to make a few extemporaneous comments. I believe that—

[English]

I believe that the matter under consideration is very important. We would probably like to reflect much longer on this issue. If Members of Parliament would like to reflect more on the issue then I am sure that Your Honour may very much welcome the suggestion to take this matter under serious consideration and reserve your decision.

In listening to all the points of view expressed today I find there could be some implication with respect to the Election Expenses Act, as has been suggested in many newspapers. However, I do not think that we should prolong unduly this debate today. Your Honour may like to take this matter under consideration to return at another time to the House with what is your customary Solomon-like decision.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave any false impressions. I will take a minute or two of the time of the House to reiterate again that all use of the word "parliamentary" is improper. In reviewing my notes I see that earlier in the debate—and I invite the Speaker to verify this at the appropriate time—I was not saying that all unauthorized use of the word "parliamentary" is improper but, indeed, that it is improper when such words are used in an attempt to mislead the people of Canada into believing that something is parliamentary or belonging to this institution when such is not the case. There is a significant difference between that and a person publishing a parliamentary guide or another tome or volume designed to assist Members of Parliament or anyone else to understand how this place functions.

I also said very clearly in my remarks that not only was this question of privilege not specific with respect to my own privileges as a Member of this House but that it is within our collective privileges as parliamentarians, as well as the privileges of this institution, to operate not only without

personal instruction to myself but that the House should be unhindered in the way that it functions. I also said very clearly that I believe that the actions taken were in contempt of Parliament. I have reflected upon that and I still believe that such is the case.

I have indicated to Your Honour, with the citation of appropriate decisions of the Speaker in the past, actions which I believe are similar or by extension should be applicable in this particular case to determine that in fact this action by Ken Lawrence Enterprises working for the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada is improper and should not be allowed to continue.

Again, I would ask that Your Honour take the matter under advisement and give it your usual full consideration with a view to referring it to the appropriate committee. Again, I will move the appropriate motion at the time that Your Honour makes his decision on what I believe is a very important case, a case without precedent. After all, we are dealing with something that did not exist a number of years ago but which is nevertheless a very fundamental issue in terms of how Parliament will be able to function in the future without being impeded by anyone or anything.

I repeat what I said earlier. I believe it is our duty as parliamentarians to uphold the dignity and the authority of this great institution. I am sure Your Honour will consider that point when you render your decision.

Mr. Speaker: First, I want to assure the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) that the Chair is as aware as is he that this is a novel question for the Chair to have to consider. However, the fact that it has not come before us before takes nothing away from the issue and the necessity to make a decision on it.

I want to thank all Hon. Members for their contributions to the debate on this issue. I will, as I often do, take the very wise advice of the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) who can teach us a great deal about procedure in this place. I think that he has given the Chair very wise counsel. I will take the matter away and think long and hard about it. I thank the Hon. Member.

It will probably be at least a few days before the Chair returns on this matter. Again, I take the matter as something which is, as I have said, new, but that does not lessen the importance of the interventions that remain. I listened to them very carefully. I will, of course, review *Hansard*. I hope that I will be able to come back with a report to the House which is appropriate under all the circumstances. Again, I thank all Hon. Members.