

I do not think this will fool Canadians. They realize that this is much more than a press release. All Members of Parliament give press releases to the media with which it does as it wishes. The media may take excerpts from them, ignore them, or use them later in editorial comment or whatever. We do not expect the media to publish our news releases verbatim as though they are the news. Yet, that is what the Parliamentary News Service is attempting to do.

This is a matter of extreme importance. If we really believe that the word "parliament" refers to the place where free and open debate takes place and decisions are ultimately made on legislation, it is very important to bring to a close quickly the matter of a Parliamentary News Agency as a reflection of the views of Parliament when it is in fact the propaganda vehicle of a political party on Parliament Hill. That is very clear.

I believe that the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) has raised a most important point with regard to the integrity of Parliament. If we believe, as we say we do, that Parliament is the ultimate forum where the points of view of Canadians are debated, then it must be free of any impression that it is the voice of any single political party or single ideological view which then becomes the true news. Such is not the case. I believe that my hon. friend has brought to the floor a very important point. I look forward to a number of other interjections on this important matter.

I have spoken with a number of constituents on this matter and know that ordinary Canadians are concerned that the news will be manipulated. This adds to a cynical view which, unfortunately, growing numbers of Canadians have of the Government of Canada. I do not want them to have that view of the institution of Parliament because I believe that people distinguish clearly between the political parties in Parliament and the institution of Parliament. We must take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that Parliament continues to mean what it always has, a forum of free and open debate in a democratic society.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to continue to publicize the efforts of Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament to bring the Liberal Party, kicking and screaming, into the electronic age. If we have time, we might get to the NDP too.

The Hon. Member who raised the question of privilege is claiming that he is prevented from discharging his duties.

Mr. Boudria: Not necessarily.

Mr. Lewis: I submit that that is what a question of privilege is.

Mr. Boudria: You don't know your rules if that is what you think.

Privilege—Mr. Boudria

Mr. Lewis: There is the odd rule I have missed, I admit, but there is the odd thing the Hon. Member has missed as well and I will get to that in a minute.

We have no difficulty with the New Democratic Party using the word "communiqué" in its generic sense, even though the Hon. Member who wrote this particular communiqué imparts a lot of information and makes a lot of comments that are clearly not true. We have not raised a question of privilege on that.

The Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) uses the words "communiqué" and uses the print media as a form of communication. We understand that and have never complained about the Opposition using the print media to further its cause. That is part of the game, whether done individually or as a political party. When we do that we do not breach the privileges of the Hon. Member.

The Hon. Member's biggest complaint is with the use of the word "parliamentary". Let us review the word "parliamentary". Are we going to stop Mr. Pierre G. Normandin who publishes the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*? I apologize for using an exhibit, Mr. Speaker, but I took these exhibits right from the Table. On the table is the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*. Does it breach the Hon. Member's privilege because it uses the word "parliamentary"? Carswell publishes *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*. Is that an abuse of the word "parliamentary" and of the Member's privileges?

Let me go on to London's Butterworths printers which publishes *A Parliamentary Dictionary*. I wonder whether tomorrow, in an effort to delay debate, there will be a question of privilege because Butterworths is using the word "parliamentary". The next example is really bad because it uses the word "Canadian" too, that is, the *Canadian Parliamentary Handbook*. This is clearly an abuse perhaps even worthy of shutting down the House. This is published by Borealis Press, Ottawa, Canada. Where is the abuse of the Member's privileges in that?

I go now right to the foundation of parliamentary practice, Erskine May abusing the Hon. Member's parliamentary privilege by using the word "parliamentary". This Member's privileges have been so badly abused through the use of the word "parliamentary" that it is a wonder he can even walk let alone function as a Member of Parliament.

I invite the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party to join us in the twenty-first century where we use electronics—the radio, electronic mail and computers, rather than only paperwork. I do not knock paperwork, but the radio has been around for awhile and television even came in the other day. When is the Hon. Member going to avail himself of the tools of communications? I am sorry to see that the New Democratic Party uses the word "new" in their official party name. I know we have described them as Luddites from time to time, but this is awful.