

Order in Council, P.C. 2415, dated 31st October, 1932: authorizing payment to the Province of Quebec of \$1,114.54 for direct relief and \$139,447.88 for public works and undertakings.

Order in Council, P.C. 2421, dated 1st November, 1932: authorizing payment to the Province of Nova Scotia of \$3,380.42 for public works.

Order in Council, P.C. 2423, dated 1st November, 1932: authorizing payment to the Province of Manitoba of \$23,548.99 for direct relief.

Order in Council, P.C. 2424, dated 1st November, 1932: authorizing payment to the Province of Alberta of \$43,424.74 for direct relief.

Mr. Hepburn, from his place in the House, asked leave under Standing Order 31, to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and stated the subject to be:—

“The necessity of immediate action being taken by this House to investigate the present financial position of the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada and the conduct of its senior officials, as disclosed by the recent police court investigation in Chicago into the affairs of Samuel Insull and Martin Insull, now indicted by the United States government on charges of embezzlement and larceny.”

MR. SPEAKER: “I have had an opportunity of considering the above motion and will not need to delay the House further by examining the statement. Under Standing Order 31 leave may be obtained to present a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. The procedure is as follows: At the proper time the Member 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. He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has leave of the House to move the adjournment for the purpose stated. A motion under this Standing Order must be restricted to a single specific matter of recent occurrence. The authority for that statement will be found in the Thirteenth Edition of May at page 247.

“In my opinion this is not a matter of recent occurrence, nor is the matter urgent. There must be a prima facie case of urgency. I refer again to May, Thirteenth Edition, page 247. The matter is not so urgent that the proceedings of the House should be halted so that it may be discussed now. The rules provide other opportunities for discussing such a matter.

“For these reasons I hold that the application is not in order and should not be granted.”

From this decision Mr. Woodsworth appealed to the House.

And the question being put by Mr. Speaker: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained; it was decided in the affirmative on the following division:—

YEAS

Messrs.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Ahearn, | Beaubier, | Bowman, | Cormier, |
| Anderson (Toronto- High Park), | Belec, | Boyes, | Cotnam, |
| Anderson (Halton), | Bell (St. John- Albert), | Burns, | Cowan (Long Lake), |
| Arsenault, | Bennett, | Bury, | Davies, |
| Arthurs, | Beynon, | Casselmann, | Dickie, |
| Baker, | Bourgeois, | Chaplin, | Dorion, |
| Barber, | Bowen, | Charters, | Duff, |
| | | Chevrier, | Dupré, |