

other similar decisions later on ruled in the same way and no appeal was made from his ruling. The matter was tried again in Mr. Speaker Fauteux's time and again in my time. When I made the ruling that there was no appeal the Leader of the Opposition made a similar appeal basing his action on the action of Mr. Ralston in 1932.

Honourable Members will recall that at that time I said as far as I am concerned there will be no further appeal of my rulings that there is no appeal on this standing order.

Although I was perhaps convinced at the beginning of my term that honourable Members would want to support the Chair with respect to this rule that rulings are not debatable, I have tried—honourable Members know that—but I have come to the conclusion that it is almost an illusion for any Speaker to think that when he makes his rulings the rulings are not debatable, because honourable Members choose to debate them.

The authority of the Canadian Speaker is such that it is entirely in the hands of the House. Notwithstanding what I said at that time, if I were to say here that there is no appeal of my ruling some honourable Members might say, "Well, he is being autocratic; he does not want to have his rulings appealed", so I have taken the view, because I feel it is the wish of the House to keep the Speaker in their hands and to have that sort of check on him, that they want to have an appeal so I did not make any objection. As a matter of fact I offered an honourable Member an opportunity to appeal my ruling not very long ago. That is my position now. It is true that there are more decisions sustaining the Speaker's ruling that there is no appeal of his decision under Standing Order 26 than that his decision is appealable. It is true that the weight of opinion is on that side. I might clear the position by allowing the House to decide. If there is another decision by the House sustaining the ruling I made last time it will give more weight to the position that there is no appeal from the Speaker's ruling, according to this Standing Order 26, when he decides that there is no appeal.

And Debate continuing on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: I just want to finalize the statement I made when the matter was raised the last time. There is a distinction. I am very much impressed by the attitude taken by the honourable Member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell). Standing Order 26 reads:

"(1) Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—"

And so on.

"(2) The member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place, asks leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and states the matter.

(3) He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order—"

These are the words:

"—and of urgent public importance—"

By that standing order the Speaker has been given the discretion to decide whether it is in order and of urgent public importance. If in his view it is not in order or of urgent public importance he does not accept it. In 1932 Mr.