

of this House. Firstly, I should like to refer honourable Members to Standing Order 12(1) which limits and defines the duties and responsibilities of the Speaker: "Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the House without debate..."

In other words, this limits the powers and responsibilities of the Speaker to deciding on questions of order, not questions of law. This is further confirmed in citation 69(3) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, at page 59: "Standing Order 12 being restrictive should be given the strictest literal interpretation..."

There is another citation referred to in the same ruling. I am still quoting from the same ruling of Friday October 25, 1963: "...I should like to refer at this time to citation 71(5) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, at page 61: "The Speaker will not give a decision upon a constitutional question nor decide a question of law, though the same may be raised on a point of order or privilege," which is what the honourable Member did at the moment he raised it as a question of order. But it shall not be the responsibility of the Chair or the Speaker to make a decision."

Lastly, I should like to refer to a more recent ruling made by Mr. Speaker Lemieux, reported in *Hansard* for June 4, 1925, page 3875:

I apologize to the honourable Member for Peace River for going back almost as far as he has in his argument.

"The Parliament of Canada is supreme, and if it should pass any Act which is *ultra vires*, the Courts would decide the validity of such Act. It is not for the Speaker to declare—although he presides over the highest Court in the land—as to whether any proposed legislation is *ultra vires*..."

Of course at this point we are not dealing with legislation but rather amendments to the rules of the House. But if I follow the honourable Member's argument, it still is based on a constitutional point. I would think this is an argument which might be advanced by the honourable Member or by other honourable Members in the course of the debate if they oppose the motion proposed by the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). In the circumstances I do not think the point of order raised by the honourable Member should be sustained.

And the question again being proposed;

Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Rynard, moved in amendment thereto,—That the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed Standing Order 75c.

And debate arising thereon;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At ten o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

#### Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4) (b), membership of Committees was amended as follows: