

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Calgary West courteously notified me of his intention to make this motion. I have had the opportunity of considering it and will not need to delay the house further by examining the motion. The hon. member is asking for leave to move the adjournment of the house to discuss an urgent matter. I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that this question is already before the house in the debate on the budget. During that debate, as he knows, it is the privilege of every hon. member to make any suggestion or recommendation to the government that he sees fit, and to discuss any matter which comes under government responsibility; therefore I do not see any urgency to adjourn the house to discuss the matter, and I cannot allow the motion to be proceeded with.

Mr. BRACKEN: I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that no debate is permitted on the decision you have made, but with all deference I must appeal against Your Honour's decision.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I respectfully point out that a large number of members who are interested in this question have already exhausted their right to speak on the budget, and therefore Your Honour's ruling will deny some hon. members the right of expression.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that I have explained my position clearly to hon. members. The object in moving the adjournment of the house under standing order 31 is to give hon. members an opportunity to discuss an urgent matter. During a session we have two debates, the first one on the address and the second on the budget, during which every hon. member has an opportunity to discuss any matter which comes under the jurisdiction and the administration of the government. In a few minutes the leader of the house will call the order to resume the debate on the budget. When that is done nearly all hon. members will have the opportunity to discuss this matter.

The leader of the C.C.F. party has called my attention to the fact that many hon. members have already spoken and will not be able to take part in the debate. I would answer him by pointing out that only forty-two members out of 242 have spoken thus far on the budget. Moreover, there is an amendment and a sub-amendment to the motion before the house. As the house knows, hon. members have an opportunity to speak on the subamendment and the amendment, and when that is disposed of they will have another opportunity to speak on the main motion. I believe therefore that it is my duty to refuse the hon. member leave,

since, according to the rules of the house there is no urgency to adjourn the house to discuss the matter.

Mr. MacINNIS: May I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that either it is an urgent matter or it is not. If it is an urgent matter, then Your Honour should allow it to be dealt with now. I have already exhausted my right to speak on the budget, but I should certainly like to speak on this matter, because it is urgent. It cannot be put off on the basis that there is an opportunity on the budget to discuss it. This is an entirely different matter, and hon. members should have an opportunity to express themselves on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I rise to a point of order—

Mr. HOMUTH: There are five thousand employees in my riding who are threatened with unemployment.

Mr. MACKENZIE: May I refer to a decision of Mr. Speaker Black of February 19, 1932? On that occasion Mr. Speaker Black ruled that there was no appeal from the Speaker's decision under standing order 31, and he was sustained by an open vote of this house.

Mr. CASSELMAN: He was wrong then.

Mr. KNOWLES: Which way did the minister vote on that occasion?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was done by a Tory Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. May I quote from Beuchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, page 747. On February 19, 1932, Mr. Ralston appealed from the Speaker's ruling on that occasion and he was not sustained. The house sustained Mr. Speaker when he ruled that there was no appeal from the decision of the Speaker under standing order 31.

Mr. MacINNIS: Did the Speaker rule that the matter was not urgent?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The Speaker ruled that there was no appeal from his decision.

Mr. MacINNIS: How did he rule in the first place?

An hon. MEMBER: Address the Chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE: In the first place the Speaker ruled that it was not a matter of urgent public importance. Mr. Ralston and I appealed from that ruling and we were not sustained.

Mr. KNOWLES: For once the minister was right.