

parliamentary press gallery would like to know, in respect of the allegations made by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), the names of other hon. members who paid money and members of the parliamentary press gallery who received such money. I think they would like to know who these people are, and would come down just as hard on them as we would in respect of allegations found to be true.

● (1440)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my intervention will be very brief. After all, you have been given plenty of words of wisdom to ponder with respect to this point. I hesitate to join in anything that might sound like an attempt to pillory the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), but it does seem that the statements he has made regarding some other members of the House of Commons are such that he ought to be given the opportunity either to confirm those statements or to withdraw them. It would seem to me that reference of the matter to a committee might be the best way to resolve it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there are no other hon. members who want to make a contribution at this time, I would first of all like to examine the precedents that have been presented to me and to give the matter some serious consideration. I would propose to review the matter, perhaps for one day, and make a decision tomorrow.

I would say immediately that there are two points I can dispose of quickly, the first being the question of notice. It is true that one of the frequent grounds for disqualifying a question of privilege has been that it has not been raised at the first opportunity. I have indicated in some areas of the application of the rules of the House that I propose to take a very stern and strict stand. However, I must say that this is one area in which I do not propose to take that stand because I think an effort has been made in this case to bring to light at the first available opportunity the question of privilege and this has been done in earlier examples when members indicated there was something which came forward during debate which might give rise to a question of privilege but they wanted the opportunity to examine the exact comments. These facts have held that technicality in abeyance in order to leave them free at a later time to raise the question for further discussion.

In addition, in this particular case the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) is accurate when he says that when the matter was raised it was inopportune to proceed with it at that time. That aspect has been resolved, after further delays until today, by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) indicating he was prepared to proceed on behalf of his party leader today. It was partially because of the inability of the hon. member for Témiscamingue to be here to participate in these discussions that it was deferred. I think it would be most unjust to hold that deferral against the person moving the motion. I am not questioning the technical element of notice because I believe the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) raised the question at the first time he had an opportunity which was at the beginning of proceedings on the day next following the speech complained of, which was made last Thursday evening.

Tributes to Mackenzie King

The second point is the question raised by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Douglas) about the seriousness of his application under Standing Order 43. I want to make it absolutely clear that simply because I held, as I have on many other occasions and will continue to hold if it is necessary to do so, a strict rule on motions proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 that not only must they be important but must be matters of urgent and pressing necessity. In this case the fact that I held this was not a matter of urgent and pressing necessity and therefore could not be moved under Standing Order 43, in no way diminishes the importance of it. There have been measures proposed pursuant to that rule which I will repeat, are always extremely important and serious measures but that does not necessarily mean that they require urgent and pressing consideration by this chamber. This is one of them. It is a very important question but it would not necessitate the standing aside of the business of the day for the House to give immediate consideration to it. I think it falls into the general area of privilege and one which is giving the Chair some concern. For that reason I propose to reserve to see whether there is a prima facie question of privilege and whether the matter ought to be resolved by referring it to a standing committee.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

THE LATE W. L. MACKENZIE KING

TRIBUTES ON COMMEMORATION OF ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a few minutes about the centennial of the birth of one of the greatest politicians of this century, William Lyon Mackenzie King.

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): Did you talk with him today?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, we can say about this man that not only does he deserve the title of great Canadian, but also that the period during which he lived and gave his services to Canada, including 22 years as Prime Minister, is itself incredible. If we go back to the year when Mr. King was born it seems unavoidable that he should have been drawn by the excitement of a political career which more than any other occupation allowed him to contribute as he wished to the growth of his country.

[English]

In a sense, Mr. King grew up with the Canadian confederation. His youth paralleled the imagination, the controversy and the faith that pushed a railroad across this country, uniting it in a physical way.

His young manhood, during which his political awareness was shaped for the future, was set against a background of war in far off lands which finally erupted on the European continent drawing Canadians into battle and death.