

Privilege—Mr. A. Lambert

It was a slander upon him and we so understood it on my side. If I misjudged the Prime Minister, if he did not so consider it, or if he did not intend his statements to be regarded in that light, he has the opportunity now to get up and say so.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation, not being a member of the front benches.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It might take you a long time to get there.

Mr. Dick: Like you, Joe, after many years I might not make it. I have listened for over one hour to speeches made on this question of privilege. I have heard much rhetoric and many allegations, many of them provocative. I have seen a lot of smiling and a lot of people thinking they are cute, and we have taken up one hour and ten minutes of the time of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dick: I think this matter might best be clarified in committee. After all, we cannot brush it under the carpet, because not only must justice be done; it must appear to be done.

An hon. Member: What a cliché.

Mr. Dick: It may be a cliché, but it has been around for a long time because there is a great deal of truth to it. Instead of spending time on counteracting and conflicting statements, I suggest that we should send this matter to committee. Let us send it out of the House to the committee to be appropriately dealt with.

● (1610)

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I can conclude the intervention on this very interesting point by saying that for the first time I can fully understand why last fall I resisted when I was called to this chair. I shall reserve my ruling on the question of privilege and try to arrive at a judgment on it by tomorrow or not later than the next day.

[Translation]

REFERENCE TO MOTION CONCERNING ISSUE OF
COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege.

At the beginning of the sitting, I submitted a motion under Standing Order 43 requiring the unanimous consent of the House. Since the motion involved no political partisanship likely to lead to controversy, I was unpleasantly surprised that it was not unanimously accepted. Would the reason for it be that the motion was in memory of a French-speaking Canadian? I do not know. Yet it was simply a question for the House of honoring one of its former servants who, in addition, was the founder of an extremely important cooperative movement in Canada and to hope that his work would continue to prosper throughout Canada.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House the utmost importance of Standing Order 28. If the Standing Orders were taken more seriously, we would not have to submit to a unanimous refusal on such important questions, without the member who has risen to oppose the motion being recognized by the Chair and identified in *Hansard*, as was the case today, on a motion of national interest. Let us beware that such a habit of systematically refusing unanimous approval lead not one day to difficult and regretful situations. The public is always entitled to know the name of a member who submits or opposes a motion.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for rising on a very important question of privilege. I am sure he understands very well that the problem is not the adoption of the motion under Standing Order 43, but simply the unanimous consent to put the motion. In any case, each time, this afternoon, as usual, I have heard not only one voice, but several voices say no, although I am not certain whether there were English or French voices, and pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, it is completely impossible not only to ask for the adoption of the motion, but even to put the motion before the House.

* * *

IMMIGRATION POLICY

First Report of Special Joint Committee on Immigration Policy—Mr. O'Connell.

[Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

STATEMENT ON NATO SUMMIT MEETING

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish briefly to report to the House on the Nato summit meeting recently concluded in Brussels. This was only the third meeting of the Nato council conducted at a head of government level in the 26 years in which this organization has been in existence. Hon. members will recall that a brief summit session took place last year following the very successful twenty-fifth anniversary foreign ministers' meeting here in Ottawa. The Ottawa meeting produced the Ottawa Declaration. This declaration was signed by heads of government in Brussels a few days later. Because of competing events here in Canada which will be well remembered by all who engaged in them, and which culminated on July 8 of last year, I was unable to travel to Brussels for that signature occasion.

The council meeting this year took place on Thursday and Friday of last week and was attended by the heads of government of 14 of the 15 member countries. The occasion was a useful one, for it permitted heads of government to be briefed on the current political situation in Europe as well as on the state of military preparedness of NATO. The speeches to the council made by some of the heads of government were released to the press and are therefore