

*Privilege—Mr. McKnight*

understand, and I am talking of the electorate of Canada, what the designation MP is, and if those initials are being usurped, and I think I am using that word properly, then it is your duty to protect the rights and privileges of those of us who serve in this House.

Going beyond that point, I would return to the Canadian Parliamentary Guide for 1980. At the back of the guide I find the personal index. On looking at several names, I find that the members who serve in this House have the initials MP after their names, and Senator Olson's name from the other place is designated as "Hon. Horace A. Olson, PC".

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member will probably be bringing up all sorts of indications of how those initials have been used in the past. This refers to usage and has nothing to do with the Standing Orders of this House. I can understand the hon. member being concerned about this matter, but all matters are not to be solved in this House. There are other places where questions of that nature can be brought forward and discussed properly. It is not for me to determine that the initials MP will be solely applicable to members sitting in this House. Many members, and other people outside this House, would perhaps argue that the meaning could be more general and that other Members of Parliament might be able to call themselves Members of Parliament, perhaps without using the initials. Even if they did use the initials, it would have to do with usage. This is not a matter for me to determine. I would plead with the hon. member to refrain from raising this now. I cannot hear this question as it does not deal with members of this House. I would not want to rule on it.

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, without again in any way questioning the decision you have made, may I urge you, Madam Chairman, to refer to page 36—

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Nielsen:** What did I say?

**Mr. Knowles:** You said "Madam Chairman".

**Mr. Nielsen:** I am very sorry. I did not realize that. Madam Speaker, I would urge you to consider page 36 of Beauchesne's, Citation 111 which states:

The Speaker of the House of Commons is the representative of the House itself in its powers, proceedings and dignity. His functions—

I should state "his or her" functions. The citation continues:

—fall into two main categories. On the one hand, he is the spokesman or representative of the House in its relations with the Crown, the Senate and other authorities and persons outside Parliament.

That is as far as I need go with that citation. Might I suggest that you reconsider the question and how you have directed yourself in dealing with the matter raised by the hon. member, and perhaps confer with your counterpart in the Senate with a view to determining whether a member of the other place has the right to use letters which by right belong and have always belonged to members of this place. It is just as illogical to assume they have that kind of right as it is for

members of this place to assume they can call themselves senators, perish the thought.

You might wish, Madam Speaker, to take that citation under consideration and perhaps discuss the matter with your counterpart in the Senate with a view to stopping a very undesirable practice. I received the same kind of letter from the senator concerned. I might say, it is the only instance of which I know when an individual senator has used those letters.

**Madam Speaker:** I am thankful to the hon. member for pointing out this particular citation, but he did not quote it to its end. I read:

On the other hand, he—

It should read "he or she". We will have to change Beauchesne. It continues:

—presides over the debates of the House of Commons and enforces the observance of all rules for preserving order in its proceedings.

That is what I have to do. When I see there is no rule I can apply to a particular situation, it is not for me to invent or write a new rule in order to resolve a situation. I am sure hon. members will understand that all I can do is apply the rules as they are written in our Standing Orders, and there is none which pertains to this particular circumstance.

• (1750)

I contend, and I stand to be corrected because I am not now applying the rules, that hon. members are quite capable of walking to the other place themselves and discussing this with senators or deciding between themselves who will be entitled to put the initials MP after their names.

I have notice of another question of privilege.

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would not the simplest way to solve this problem be to abolish the Senate?

**Mr. Gauthier:** Question.

**Mr. Knowles:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** I have notice of another question of privilege in the name of the hon. member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens).

MR. STEVENS—ALLEGED LACK OF IMPARTIALITY OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA IN CARRYING OUT HIS DUTIES

**Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel):** Madam Speaker, as you know from the letter I delivered to your office before one o'clock I wish to raise a question of privilege which, if you should find a prima facie case in my favour, would lead to my moving the following motion:

That the increasing tendency of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada to act in a manner incompatible with the separate requirements and traditions of each of his two portfolios, and the continued inability of the House to obtain independent legal advice from the Attorney General in keeping with the proper constitutional place of that officer of the Crown, as set out in the Department of Justice Act and in particular Section 5 thereof, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.