

morning's mail. I was interested about what material was coming but I did not see the material until this morning.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, let me clarify the point made by my hon. colleague. The memo was addressed to the Progressive Conservative Members of the House of Commons only. In other words, regardless of when it might have arrived on the Member's desk, it was destined to a select group of Members of the House of Commons. That was the point my hon. colleague was attempting to make.

It is obvious that this is favouritism, and when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) directs mail on a very critical item only to certain political Members of the House of Commons, we obviously find that our privileges have been breached.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has listened carefully to the intervention of the Hon. Member for Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands (Mr. Manly) and others Members. I will consider the matter and report back to the House.

ALLEGED MISUSE OF THE WORD PARLIAMENTARY—RULING OF MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that I am now prepared to report on two questions of privilege, the first brought some days ago by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), and the second is a matter of privilege brought by the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus). I shall deal first with the question of privilege of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell who rose on September 22, 1987.

The issue he raised concerned what he alleged was a misuse of the word "parliamentary" by the service known as the Parliamentary New Service.

In presenting his argument, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell cited the case from May 6, 1985, where the words "Member of Parliament" were used by other than the currently elected Member for that riding, and the Speaker ruled that a breach of privilege had occurred because the Member could be impeded in fulfilling his duties if confusion existed in the minds of his constituents as to who the Member really was. That particular ruling is of interest, but I have to advise the Hon. Member regretfully that I did not find it of assistance in the present case.

[Translation]

Also, the 1983 incident referred to by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) had to do with a newspaper advertisement which the public could have seen as a quote from Hansard, which it was not. The sacred nature of Hansard has always been protected, and while the press is at liberty to quote from it, they must do it truthfully rather than try to mislead the public by altering or falsifying the record as published in the *House of Commons Debates*.

Ruling of Mr. Speaker

• (1510)

[English]

A similar case occurred in 1960 when the Sperry and Hutchinson Company reproduced the *Debates* of the House and the Speaker ruled that anything that relates to control by the House, present or future, over its own reports, having the possibility of abuse of such publications in mind—which is easily imaginable—required the Speaker to allow to go forward by finding at least *prima facie* grounds for complaint. This is found in the *Journals* of the House, February 16, 1960, at pages 157 and 158.

In 1965, the Steelworkers Hamilton Council-PAC News used the cover of the *Debates* in its newsletter. The Speaker ruled that there was a *prima facie* case of privilege and based his ruling on the 1960 case.

[Translation]

However, in none of those matters do I find any parallel with the point raised by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. All the cases referred to involved deliberate attempts at misleading the public by falsely depicting a document as a quote from Hansard. Truly, such is not the case in this instance.

[English]

There are a number of previous rulings which dealt with incidents concerning "parliamentary task forces" composed of members from only one Party caucus. In the "Parliamentary Task Force" case of December 10, 1979, the issue revolved around the question of the use of public funds for examinations conducted by members of one political Party. In the 1980 case, the issue concerned the use of the term "parliamentary task force" for what was essentially a special committee. In the first case, Speaker Jerome stated:

—in my opinion the greater wisdom would be to ensure that in every case—where public funds are used to support such a committee—such a committee consist of Members of more than one Party in the House.

As can be seen, these two cases do not directly apply here. There has been no allegation that public funds are involved in the Parliamentary News Service.

The most direct pronouncement on the use of an expression relating to Parliament is found in Statutes. The Act respecting the use of the expression "Parliament Hill" was given Royal Assent on May 19, 1972. The purpose of this Act was to prevent the commercial use of the words "Parliament Hill".

In the case being raised by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, however, the question at issue is whether or not the use of the word "parliamentary" by itself should be restricted in any way by the House.

As the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) pointed out to the House, the dictionary defines "parliamentary" as "of or relating to Parliament", and of course "Parliament" is defined as "the Council forming with the Sovereign the supreme legislature consisting of the House of Commons