

My breach of privilege, Madam Speaker, I believe occurred at Routine Proceedings at page 28349 of *Hansard*. Briefly, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that I rose at precisely the same time as, if not before, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). I think that is confirmed by the official report of the House of Commons debates, namely *Hansard*. I can say to you that we really have no other official record to go by. There is really nothing else to go by but the record of *Hansard*.

I want to quote precisely what happened. At page 28349 we find:

MADAM SPEAKER: Motions.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order—

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister of Transport.

MR. AXWORTHY: Madam Speaker, I move—

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

MR. NIELSEN: A point of order.

MR. EPP: A point of order.

MR. MCKNIGHT: A point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

HON. DON MAZANKOWSKI (VEGREVILLE): I move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard, Madam Speaker.

MR. PINARD: A point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a motion on the floor.

MR. PINARD: A point of order.

I would then like to refer to your words, Madam Speaker, at page 28357 for October 26, 1983, prior to the vote. You stated in your observations, I guess would be a fair way of putting it:

What has to be clear and what I reaffirmed before the House is that several Members rose at the same time—

If you go back and look at the actual transpiration of events, Madam Speaker, you will note that those Members to whom you referred were recorded as having risen after I was recorded as asking to be recognized on a point of order and after the Minister of Transport had been recognized by you. I merely point that out. You said that you were having difficulty in ascertaining who should or should not be recognized because there were several Members—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I did not say I had difficulty. I said that the Chair has to select when several Members rise at the same time. That is what the Chair has done. I selected one of the Members who had risen at the same time.

I have dealt with the matter the Hon. Member is raising. If the Hon. Member were writing the verbatim report of what took place in the House and if three Members rose at the same time and shouted "A point of order", how would he list them in the report? He would make an arbitrary listing of those three people who rose at the same time. The argument the Hon. Member is using is not totally convincing. It does not convince me. Furthermore, the Hon. Member knows that when several Members rise at the same time it is customary to recognize a Minister before any other Member. This kind of courtesy has been afforded to Ministers in our House and in many other Houses. I do not have the exact reference, but I

*Privilege—Mr. Mazankowski*

am sure it was in Erskine May that I read it was the practice in Great Britain.

● (1510)

I have dealt with the matter. Further, the Hon. Member does not have a question of privilege. It is a point of order, if he has one. I dealt with this the other day. Furthermore, the entire proceeding is over. We have had the motion, we have had the debate, we have had the vote—the entire proceeding is over. I really do not see what is the point of raising a point of order on that particular matter at the present time.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Madam Speaker, I hope you will allow me to make one further point. I was not aware that Standing Order 33 provided for a different status of Member being recognized. That is really my second point. If there was any doubt, it seems to me it is incumbent that there be a strict application of Standing Order 32 and Standing Order 33. Under the heading "Rules of Debate", Standing Order 32 reads:

Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his or her place, uncovered, and address the Speaker.

It is fair to say that I was uncovered, and probably so was the Minister of Transport. Madam Speaker has suggested that there are two classes of Members, but Standing Order 33 reads:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

There is a no indication there about having been recognized or about whether a Minister has the floor. It reserves the right for a Member of Parliament to be heard.

There are the rules which have been established by the House of Commons. The House of Commons is master of its own house. It establishes its own rules, it administers them and enforces them. I humbly submit that under the provisions of Standing Order 33 my rights as a Private Member of this Chamber were denied. I believe very firmly that I had the parliamentary right to put my motion. If we are to have a set of Standing Orders, then there should be provisions that qualify how the Standing Orders will be applied. They are certainly not contained in this rule book. Either this rule book has some meaning, or we might as well throw it out the window.

**Madam Speaker:** The rule book has a lot of meaning, but it has to be read against practices, against interpretations of several authors, the authority of which we accept, namely, Erskine May, Bourinot, Beauchesne and possibly others, and against the precedents. This is what the Chair is constantly doing.

I am sure the Hon. Member does not want to suggest that Members do not have equal rights. They all have equal rights in the House, but courtesies are afforded to certain Members as a matter of practice and as a matter of general consensus in the House. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition will rise