

## RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: The ruling which I have to make now is whether there should be an adjournment of the proceedings of the House to consider a matter of definite and urgent importance, according to the terms of Standing Order 26.

The effect of this adjournment would be to allow a debate until five o'clock because, according to Standing Orders, an adjournment debate at this time does not dispense with Private Members' hour, and I think honourable Members will agree with me it would be just a bit out of place and improper to grant an adjournment for a 15 minute debate.

In any event if I require an authority to support my view that there should not be an adjournment, there was a ruling made in the House earlier in the session—I will not say on the same question, but on a similar question—at which time there was a ruling that there should not be an adjournment.

Honourable Members know, and I have said this before, it is only in extreme circumstances that an adjournment is granted. It has not happened more than a very few times in many years that the business of the house has been adjourned. It may well be that this is a type of business on which there should be an adjournment, but I have before me a motion in particular circumstances and I do not think that I can grant it in view of all the circumstances.

One point I would like to bring to the attention of honourable Members is citation 100(9) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, as recorded at page 91 of that work, which states: "matters of privilege or order, or matters debatable only upon a substantive motion, cannot be submitted to the House under this Standing Order."

If the honourable Member is right then he has a question of privilege, and according to this citation the Chair cannot grant an adjournment of the House to consider a matter which the honourable Member says is a question of privilege and, as he has said himself, there has been no ruling from the Chair to the effect that there was no question of privilege.

The ruling was based on the point that the question had not been raised on the earliest possible occasion. In view of this I cannot accept the motion but I would like to suggest, if this would be helpful to the honourable Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent), that in view of the fact that he has a motion—it may be a motion of privilege, I am not saying that it is and I am not saying that it is not—I believe he should consider the possibility of submitting this motion to the Chair. It would then be placed on the Order Paper, but I would be pleased to discuss the matter with the honourable Member and I think he should give some thought to this possibility.

The honourable Member may not feel that it should be done in this way and I respect his views, but certainly it would have the result of bringing the matter before the House for eventual resolution by honourable Members.

If honourable Members feel we should go on for the 15 minutes remaining with Orders of the Day, then I shall call Orders of the Day.

---

Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers Nos. 8, 72, 149, 156, 159, 160, 162, 163 and 164 were allowed to stand at the request of the government.

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all notes, documents, minutes or other documents or correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and Governments of members of the Commonwealth Carib-