

"Similarly a matter concerning an article in a newspaper published on 6 May was refused precedence because it was not raised till the 14th and a speech reported on a Saturday because it was not raised until the following Tuesday. On the other hand, when special circumstances justified it, the Speaker has permitted a member to raise a matter on the day following the date of issue of the newspaper containing the article complained of."

These citations show how strict are our rules and precedents in connection with the necessity of raising a matter at the earliest possible opportunity.

The honourable Member knows, as all honourable Members know, that we have any number of precedents on this very important point. I have one before me, reported in *Hansard* of May 10, 1966, at page 4923. On that day the honourable Member for Québec-Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) raised a matter referring to a broadcast of the C.B.C. on May 5. The Chair ruled as follows: "Since this involves a matter which, according to the honourable Member himself, goes back to Thursday last, I do not feel the question of privilege has been raised at the earliest opportunity. For this reason, I cannot find that a question of privilege exists in the circumstances."

The honourable Member knows that this question has been raised on a number of occasions in the current session. In particular, the honourable Member for Halifax (Mr. Forrestall) raised this very matter in connection with a proposed adjournment under Standing Order 26 on September 7 last, and also on August 30, 1966, a number of questions were asked by the honourable Member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) and the right honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

It is obvious that this matter has not been raised in the form of a question of privilege at the earliest possible opportunity. For this reason I must rule, not on the question of whether there is a *prima facie* case but on the point of order as to whether this matter has been raised at the earliest opportunity, and I suggest to the honourable Member that he has not satisfied this requirement.

---

And the honourable Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) having risen on a point of order in support of his contention that this was his earliest opportunity of raising the question in the House;

#### STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the honourable Member's anxiety to express his point of view on the point of order as to whether he raised the question at the earliest opportunity. My suggestion to him and my submission to the House is that it is not the sense of the rules and the purport of the practices of this chamber that when a Member has satisfied himself after a month, two months or six months that he has a good case, he can come forward and raise the matter as a question of privilege.

I suggest to the honourable Member that there is no precedent whatever that I have been able to ascertain or that I could quote in support of the honourable Member's point of view. With regret I must maintain the ruling that I made a moment ago, that this matter having been raised—and it is substantially the same matter that the honourable Member now raises—and put before the House on the occasion of questions, and particularly as a motion by the honourable Member for Halifax under Standing Order 26, it cannot be considered now.

---

On motion of Mr. Pilon, seconded by Mr. McNulty, it was ordered,—That the name of Mr. Scott (Danforth) be substituted for that of Mr. Cameron