

Privilege

sees this as a breach of privilege indicates the seriousness of what we are discussing.

Some may argue that since the member in question is no longer a member from Simcoe South, there is no risk of confusion in terms of what the member has or has not done and, therefore, there are likely no privileges that have been breached. I would argue to the contrary, that as long as there is some confusion over who is and who is not a member, it affects all of our abilities to perform as members. In that sense, any individual appearing to—

Mr. Speaker: There seem to be some salient facts here. There does not seem to be any doubt at the moment, at least in the Chamber, that the hon. former member referred to is no longer a member. There may have been some doubt in the United States as to whether he was or was not, but has there been any doubt here?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there has ever been any doubt. As a matter of fact, there no longer is a member for Simcoe South, so the matter has changed significantly.

Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, at page 195, describes one class of contempt as being "the interference with the corporate rights of the House". It states:

When the corporate rights of the House are interfered with in some way, the "breach of privilege" could result in the offender being held in contempt of the House—

Surely, the House of Commons shares the same corporate rights as other corporate bodies, including the important right to claim sole use of our Coat of Arms, stationery, and freedom from the misrepresentation of our views by others.

What has become clear, as a result of communications from a variety of people, is that someone decided to masquerade as a Member of Parliament, or to set up a previous Member of Parliament as being an existing Member of Parliament and having advocated something most of us find unacceptable—the opposition to linguistic duality in our country. Thousands of these letters have been sent out, allegedly signed by the previous

member from Simcoe South with the use of his name and stationery in one form or another.

Surely, when someone has misrepresented a previous member, it is something that we ought to be very concerned about. Therefore, I think the reference of this matter to the appropriate committee would be more than appropriate. If we do not, are we in a sense saying that any organization that wants to manufacture a letterhead using the names of existing or previous members of Parliament, the Coat of Arms of Canada, or whatever other set of symbols, is appropriate? Are we simply going to say that we have nothing to say about the misrepresentation and misuse of stationery, and, by implication, a former member's or perhaps even a present member's name? I think it is very serious and something must be done.

Since we have had new information, whether or not there has been a contempt of the House by the previous member, I think, can be set aside. Nevertheless, someone or some organization is masquerading as a previous Member of Parliament in expressing a very disgusting viewpoint. At least, I would like to think that everyone here would consider it disgusting.

I support the views put forward by my hon. friend speaking on behalf of the Liberals. As I indicated in my letter to you of April 18, if you find a *prima facie* case of contempt of the House in this case, I, too, would encourage the appropriate motion to be put.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened to argument and I promised the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that I would give him a short reply. I point out to him that I think I have the salient facts, also the argument and issue.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I only want to take one or two moments and I would like to get the attention of the government House leader briefly.

It is against the Standing Orders of this House to say that someone else has maligned, is guilty of malignity, or deliberately maligned. I do believe that that remark was made about me by the government House leader in reference to Mr. Stewart.

In no way did I say that Mr. Stewart was—

• (1530)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may very well have a point. In order to keep this tidy, I would ask him to not