

*Northern Development*

of Standing Order 17(2). After giving the matter serious thought, I have to advise the hon. member that I would find it extremely difficult to agree that we have before us a prima facie case of privilege. Successive Speakers have been required to give a definition of parliamentary privilege. In most instances, the Chair has alluded to the definition given by Sir Erskine May which is to be found at page 42 of the 17th Edition of this author's work on parliamentary practice. The learned author states:

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals.

Parliamentary privilege is also defined as:

The sum of the fundamental rights of the House and of its individual Members as against the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of the ordinary courts of law—

The question is whether in the circumstances described there has been a prima facie breach of the rights and immunities of members of the House of Commons. I suggest to the hon. member and to the House that essentially the hon. member for Mackenzie is inviting the Chair to determine a question of law in respect of certain administrative actions by the government. I am unable to see how in such circumstances the Chair can be called upon to consider the matter on the basis of breach of parliamentary privilege.

I might add that even if there had been, in the opinion of the Chair, a prima facie case of privilege the hon. member's motion could not have been accepted procedurally because it proposes simply that, and I quote: the subject matter of this question of privilege be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

This, in itself, is an indication that what the hon. member wishes to have considered is the government's administrative actions which could quite properly be considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, while a matter of parliamentary privilege ought to be considered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

For these reasons, the Chair is not free to put to the House the motion proposed by the hon. member for Mackenzie.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS****BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE****TIME ALLOCATION ORDER ON REPORT STAGE AND  
THIRD READING OF BILL C-176**

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that the representatives of the several parties have reached an agreement with regard to the proposed allotment of time for the disposition of the report stage and the third reading stage of Bill C-176. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the making of the motion has been preceded by consultations with the parties opposite. It is proposed that when motion

[Mr. Speaker.]

No. 1 is before the House again, the government will be moving an amendment to that motion which has been the subject of discussions between the official opposition and the government, and that when the House is considering Motion No. 27 there will also be an amendment submitted by the government which has been the subject of discussions with the New Democratic Party. Also, within this motion, the rights of the Social Credit Party with regard to their wish to participate at certain stages of the debate have been fully protected.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 75A, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson):

That when the consideration of Bill C-176, an act to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, is resumed in this day's sitting, the House shall first consider motions (1), (5) and (22), including any amendment to be proposed and, then, to any amendment that may be proposed to clause (18) of the bill, and next to motion numbered 27, and any amendment that may be proposed thereto.

At the expiry of 90 minutes, if required, for the discussion of each of the above item or items stated in paragraph (1) of this motion, every question necessary to conclude consideration of the specified item or items shall be forthwith put and any recorded division, if demanded, shall be deferred.

If the items listed in paragraph (1) are concluded prior to 10 p.m., the House will revert to motion numbered (2) and continue to consider other motions in the sequence listed on the Notice Paper.

That during the further consideration of the report stage of the said bill, no member may speak longer than 10 minutes at any time.

At 10:00 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith and successively every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the said bill.

After the disposal of the report stage of the said bill, the House shall proceed forthwith to the consideration of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill, and shall continue to sit until proceedings thereon have been concluded, and during such proceedings no member may speak longer than 20 minutes at any time.

Mr. Speaker, I forgot to mention one point, that is that the Minister of Agriculture will be seeking to make an amendment to clause 18 of the bill, the subject of which is well known to members of the House.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. It arises out of Standing Order 75A which reads in part:

—there is agreement among the representatives of all parties . . . setting forth the terms of such agreed allocation; and every such motion shall be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment.

My question of privilege is to obtain from you, Mr. Speaker, a statement on the position of an independent private member in this House. Has he any status at all under this part of our Standing Order?

**Mr. Speaker:** The question asked by the hon. member is somewhat hypothetical. I think that if it were asked by the Speaker, perhaps it might have practical implications. If I must rule on the question asked by the hon. member, which I consider to be hypothetical at this point, my understanding is that the Standing Order has been drafted in such a way that the parties recognized as parties in the House would be the ones which would have to be recognized for the purpose of interpreting Standing Order 75A, B and C. I am not sure whether that is the way the