

Mr. Mazankowski: On his behalf, I will take that question as a representation. I should point out that in May of 1986, the Department of Transport, under the authority of the Treasury Board, increased the funding for airport security by some \$33.6 million, with additional resources. I believe that the security and surveillance system at our airports has one of the highest standards in the world. I know all Members will join me in supporting their efforts in that regard.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

CLARIFICATION BY MEMBERS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that at page 9150 of yesterday's *Hansard* I may have inadvertently left the impression that I accused some specific individual in this House of a deliberate attempt to deceive. I want to say categorically that it was not my intention. If people have been hurt by that, I apologize. If I ever come to the point where I think it is happening, I will be very specific about it. It was not my intention and I apologize.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) has risen on a point of order of his own volition, which may very well obviate the necessity of hearing another point. However, there is an Hon. Member who has given me notice of an application. The Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais) on the same point.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jourdenais: Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the explanation of the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes). He spoke about an individual, but I would have liked him to mention the name of this individual because I was personally involved. I do not believe that his excuses were personal. They were very general. I would therefore like him to explain his point of order. Who exactly did he attack?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to limit any Hon. Member's right in this Chamber when it comes to a matter upon which the Hon. Member may feel grieved. I would invite the Hon. Member for Calgary West to rise, perhaps just for a moment, and be absolutely specific. I think that might end the matter.

● (1510)

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais) in mind. I had no specific Member of the House in mind. I did not put my remarks in that context and I am sorry offence was taken. I do apologize and I will try to be more careful with the way I string my thoughts together in future.

Privilege—Mr. Boudria

Mr. Speaker: I think that is about as abject as we are likely to get in this Chamber.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED MISUSE OF THE WORD PARLIAMENTARY

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to raise before the House and Your Honour an action which I believe to be in contempt of Parliament, thereby impeding this House in the performance of its function and affecting the privileges of all Members of Parliament. Let me say at the outset that if you deem I have a prima facie case of privilege, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion to refer the subject matter to the appropriate parliamentary committee.

The issue I raise concerns what I believe to be a misuse of the word "parliamentary" by the Progressive Conservative Party or an agent of that organization in the offering of a service to be known as the Parliamentary News Service. I bring to your attention the communiqué released by one Ken Lawrence on behalf of the Parliamentary News Service which says:

We are the mechanism to get you and the Progressive Conservative MPs together.

It goes on to describe other ways in which Conservative Members of Parliament are to be communicated with by means of this so-called Parliamentary News Service.

Erskine May's Twentieth Edition, speaking to the issue of contempt of Parliament, at page 143 states:

It may be stated generally that any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent for the offence.

Clearly we are talking about a situation which has never arisen before. I also want to bring to your attention the definition of privilege which is important to your adjudication of this case. It is described at page 11 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition:

They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity.

I submit that an organization should not refer to goods or services as parliamentary, thereby leading the people of Canada to believe that a service originates from Parliament Hill when such is not the case. I cite some rulings for your information.

On May 6, 1985, the Hon. Member for Parkdale—High Park (Mr. Witer) raised before this House what he said was a misuse of the words "Member of Parliament", by a former