

I ask honourable Members, is the method of financing a matter that is so pressing that the public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention today?

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and I may feel that way, that whatever is on the Order Paper today appointed for discussion should be put aside in order to discuss this matter. The urgency of this motion applies to the debate, and I am inclined to think there will be opportunities shortly for the discussion of this matter. Of course, it is of public importance and it is urgent in the sense that all Canadians wish to keep things moving. We are a progressive, expanding country, and we all want to do things as soon as possible. But is there urgency of debate in connection with this motion? I am inclined to think there is not.

I am making a ruling now and it is not debatable nor appealable. Let us stop having that traditional rule that Speaker's rulings are not debatable be an illusion.

The other point I wish to make is that the matter must be one of recent occurrence. This is a matter that has been dealt with everywhere, in the press and in this House for many, many months now. I come to the conclusion that in my humble view this is not a matter of urgent public importance in the sense which is traditionally the one known to be the sense in Standing Order 26 and therefore I do not accept the motion.

I want to say that precisely because of the strength the honourable Member for Rosetown-Biggart gave me I feel fortified and I can assure him that as far as I am concerned any decision that I make under Standing Order 26 will not be appealable as long as I am Speaker. That is quite definite. See *Debates*, volume 1, 1932, pages 360-6; *Journals*, 1932, pages 62 and 63, volume 70; *Debates*, volume 2, 1939, page 1748; *Journals*, 1939, page 178, volume 77; *Debates*, volume 3, 1941, pages 2298-9; *Debates*, volume 1, 1944, pages 417-20; *Debates*, volume 3, 1944, pages 2381-2; *Debates*, volume 3, 1944, pages 2425-7; *Debates*, volume 1, 1945, pages 736-41; *Debates*, volume 4, 1946, pages 3440-43; *Debates*, volume 2, 1947, pages 1828-30; *Debates*, volume 1, 1948, pages 122-3; *Journals*, 1955, page 855, volume 99.

On motion of Mr. Brooks, seconded by Mr. Pearkes, it was ordered,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda and other documents exchanged during the past three years between any department or officials of the Federal Government and the International Joint Commission, the Government of the United States of America, and any other government or organization or individuals, relating to a survey or surveys of the economic feasibility of the development of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. (**Notice of Motion No. 70*).

On motion of Mr. Reinke, seconded by Mr. Brown (Brantford), it was ordered,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged, from January 1, 1950 to date, between the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Highways of the Province of Ontario, regarding the high level bridge over the Burlington ship canal. (**Notice of Motion No. 74*).