

*Ruling of Mr. Speaker*

and the Senate". Therefore, anything describing or relating to either Chamber or the two Chambers together in conjunction with the Queen could be termed "parliamentary".

Does the use of the word "parliamentary" in the Parliamentary News Service not describe the fact that the news covered by the service relates to or concerns Parliament? I think that is true. The news it provides may be, in fact probably is, selected with a view to enhancing a particular perspective. Does this alter the fact that it relates to Parliament? Any newspaper or broadcaster in the country always has been and continues to be free to select those items emanating from Parliament which they believe to be of interest to the public. Because this place is an institution composed of partisan, political people, there are often opposing viewpoints reflecting in its proceedings. I would think there are few Canadians who are not aware of that fact.

*[Translation]*

The question before me is whether the use of the term "parliamentary", in this instance, is a breach of privilege or some sort of contempt of the House.

*[English]*

Hon. Members all know that privilege is a narrowly defined procedural expression. To quote from Erskin May's *Parliamentary Practice*, it is:

—the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals.

*[Translation]*

Having examined the recorded precedents and studied the substance of the matter raised, I am not convinced that the rights or privileges of any Member have been breached. I have not been convinced either that the dignity of Parliament or the integrity of its proceedings have been compromised by the use of the term "parliamentarian" in this case. I cannot therefore conclude that this is a genuine question of privilege.

*[English]*

I do feel, however, that a legitimate concern has been raised by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. Both the Chair and indeed all Hon. Members of the House should be conscious of the need to protect and enhance the reputation of Parliament and of this House and be vigilant in their duty in this regard.

I might say to the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that sometimes the line between the position he is taking and that which is permissible can indeed be very fine. I would say that to the degree possible, when others are using the word "parliamentary", they might take into account that very fine distinction.

I thank the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for raising the matter and I also thank all those who participated in the discussion. There is not, however, in the Chair's view, a breach of privilege in this instance.

I might say to the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that he has probably done the House and the public some service in bringing the matter to the attention of the Chair.

I now turn to another matter of privilege.

## ALLEGED IMPROPER ACQUISITION OF LETTER—RULING OF MR. SPEAKER

**Mr. Speaker:** On October 28, 1987, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus) rose on a question of privilege. The issue he raised related to a letter referred to by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake (Mr. Gormley) during Statements by Members earlier that day.

I asked the officials responsible for providing printing services to investigate the matter concerning the printing of the letter in question. The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp) submitted a two-page letter and an attached petition to the printing unit in the Wellington Building on Friday, October 23. These two documents were reproduced in 2,700 copies according to the Hon. Member's request and they were returned to the Member's office on Monday, October 26.

The employees involved in printing, folding and handling of this request have provided assurances that they did not retain or distribute copies of this material to anyone other than the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon. I should further note that in submitting this request to the printing unit, neither the Hon. Member nor his staff gave any indication that the material was either confidential or sensitive.

It may well be that the Hon. Member or his staff did not feel that that was necessary. However, had the Hon. Member indicated that the material was sensitive or confidential, the procedure that would have been taken is that it would have been produced under tight supervision and returned to the Hon. Member in a sealed package, which would have included any waste or damaged copies that resulted from the printing and folding operation.

I cannot find that any irregularity occurred in this instance, nor can I find that that any Hon. Members' privileges have been breached in any way. However I thank the Hon. Member for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. It may well be that again that this matter having been brought to the attention of the House, the same problem will not happen again.

I would say to all Hon. Members that if there is any difficulty with security in the printing of material on behalf of any Hon. Member, it would be helpful if any such instances were brought to the attention of the Chair. Hon. Members will realize, having seen the facilities where printing is done, that it does take some extra special effort to have absolute security. I hope that this report back to the House is of some satisfaction to the Hon. Member and I thank him for raising the matter.