

*Privilege—Mr. Boudria*

MP. The Speaker said at that time, and I quote from page 4439 of *Hansard*:

It should go without saying that a Member of Parliament needs to perform his functions effectively and that anything tending to cause confusion as to a Member's identity creates the possibility of an impediment to the fulfilment of that Member's functions.

If it was true that anything that confused people as to a Member of Parliament's identity could be an offence, then by extension I say to you that anything that confuses the identity of what is parliamentary or Parliament itself would have to be adjudicated in a similar manner.

I also want to bring to your attention the case of Sperry & Hutchison, a firm that used *Hansard* for publicity in the past and was deemed to have been in contempt of this House. Therefore, if the use of a parliamentary document for something that was not parliamentary was deemed to be an offence, the word "parliamentary" I submit should be treated in the same matter.

In 1983 there occurred an incident where advertisements were placed in the Ottawa *Citizen* and two other newspapers by an individual named Harry Rosen which depicted Parliament Hill and a caption with the words:

Madam Speaker, I move we adjourn so we can all go to the opening of Harry's new store!

Counsel, on behalf of the Speaker, wrote to Mr. Rosen and the newspapers in question ordering them to cease and desist. I have a copy of that advertisement and it was designed in such a way as to confuse people into believing that parliamentarians had said or were purported to have said that they were doing something they were not in fact doing in Parliament.

I am not saying that all unauthorized usage of the word "parliamentary" is improper. That would be ludicrous and I am sure you would agree. However, in my view it is improper to attempt to mislead people into believing something belongs to Parliament when it does not. For that reason I think you should investigate the case I am bringing before you.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1980, as shown on page 4214 of *Hansard*, the Speaker had this to say about contempt of Parliament:

I can assure all Hon. Members that the dimension of contempt of Parliament is such that the House will not be constrained in finding a breach of privileges of Members, or of the House.

This is what Madam Speaker said on October 29, 1980.

[English]

Perhaps Joseph Maingot, Q.C., in his book *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada* said it best when, on page 196, he stated:

Contempt is whatever House finds as contempt.

While we are dealing here with an issue which has not occurred before, I submit that it cannot be argued by anyone as not being contempt simply because the issue has not been brought to the attention of Parliament. Indeed, what I am

describing is the service of a satellite to broadcast propaganda on behalf of a political Party. That could be offensive in itself, but to do so under the name of this Parliament I believe is in contempt of this House.

I also believe there could be potential breaches of Acts of Parliament such as the Parliament Hill Act, the Trade Marks Act, and the PC Party may even be guilty of what lawyers call "passing off"; trying to make someone believe that a service is something other than what it really is.

In summary, I submit that the dignity of this institution is such that we have the authority to stop anyone and anything attempting to diminish the authority and dignity of the Parliament of our country.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to put my case before the House.

[English]

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Hon. Member has raised this important matter today. I suspect many of us have been in our constituencies over the weekend and have been approached by constituents asking about this new service emanating from Parliament Hill and whether it was a parliamentary service or whether it was what has been referred to at times as "Tory TV" or the "Tory Good News Network" or other such terms.

I think the issue at hand is very serious. As Members of Parliament, we are all too well aware that Parliament means certain things to Canadians. The institution, which includes the House of Commons and the Senate, is clearly understood by Canadians. Parliamentary traditions, institutions, practices and procedures are well known to Canadians to a greater or lesser degree. Parliament is symbolized as a place where different views from across Canada come together and are debated and where decisions are ultimately made.

● (1520)

The dictionary describes Parliament simplistically as an assembly which makes a country's laws. This is the assembly, the House of Commons and, unfortunately, the Senate. I say "unfortunately" because I do not know if that is the appropriate continuance.

The people of Canada have come to respect what they refer to as Parliament. Parliament has become a very important symbol for free people everywhere.

I hate to mention this to you, Mr. Speaker, but it relates to whether or not a question of privilege exists. On the weekend people reminded me that there are official news agencies in countries around the world through which the official news is related. I do not need to cite the specific names of these news agencies as we are all well aware of them. Last week it was announced that there would now be an "official view" of the news, which would be the Government's view, not Parliament's or the Opposition's, but the Government's view of the news.