

the extent to which the proposition concerns the administrative responsibilities of the government or would come within the scope of ministerial action, and also the probability of the matter being brought before the House within a reasonable time by other means. Additionally, the Chair must have regard to other considerations, many of which have been established as the practice of the House in previous years, before the enactment of the present Standing Orders.

The question raised by the honourable Member, it seems to me, does concern the administrative responsibilities of the government.

As far as the opportunity for the question being raised before the House within a reasonable time by other means is concerned, the Chair must have in mind the fact that in the present state of its business the House is not likely to have available certain opportunities which on previous occasions would have provided a vehicle for a debate on this question. As an example, there is no current debate in respect to the Speech from the Throne. We learned from the Minister of Finance yesterday that there is some uncertainty whether or not there will be a budget debate within the near future, and the estimates are not likely to be tabled until some time in February.

There is another matter which I think may be of some importance and that has to do with the alteration in circumstances surrounding emergency debates before the enactment of the current Standing Order 26. Before the present order was brought into force, in considering motions to adjourn under Standing Order 26 the Chair always had to weigh the importance of the proposed motion against the necessity of setting aside government business for the day, and it was much more difficult to justify the granting of a motion under Standing Order 26 when that would have the result of delaying current important public business. To a considerable extent the revised Standing Order 26 reduces the relative significance of this factor.

In deciding whether or not to allow the motion the Chair must, of course, take into account the actual problem sought to be discussed. Is it of national importance and is it urgent?

In my opinion the new circumstances indicated by the questions asked in the House yesterday, by the concern expressed by the Minister himself when replying to these questions, and by the honourable Member's statement, indicate that a strong case can be made in favour of the proposed motion, on the ground of urgency of debate.

Therefore, I am inclined to put the question to the House in accordance with the Standing Order for the reasons stated; that the matter is important, that there is urgency of debate, that the opportunity for debate within a reasonable time is restricted, and that public business is not impeded.

The question before the House is the following one: Has the honourable Member leave to move the motion for the purpose of discussing the matter stated by him?

---

And the honourable Member having obtained leave of the House for the purpose of discussing the stated matter, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section (9) of Standing Order 26, directed that the proposed motion stand over until 8.00 o'clock p.m. this day.

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House copies of any maps and diagrams in the possession of the Department of Transport which show what changes will result in noise levels in the surrounding inhabited areas should