he undertook to read, and the Speaker called him to order because it was against the rules of the house.

In this house during the last few years I can recall very vividly the then leader of the opposition calling upon the Speaker to enforce order against a member who was dealing with a technical matter and was reading what he had to say, involving medical terms, and he replied, "I have to resort to my notes." Notes may be resorted to, which is an altogether different thing from reading a speech. If the rule is to be enforced, it should be enforced against all members of the house by the Speaker, and not by the members calling upon the Speaker, because the rules of our parliament contemplate that he himself should take notice of that fact.

I mention these things because they are merely illustrations of what you might call the unwritten and the written rules, and that great body of unwritten precedents which has come down through the ages is of the utmost importance in the rulings of the Speaker of the chamber.

It has not been usual for Speakers to be opposed when they are nominated in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister. But in England as late as 1895 a great conflict took place between Mr. Gully and Sir Matthew White Ridley, and it will be recalled that at that time the discussion became rather acrimonious on the part of both Sir William Vernon Harcourt and the then Mr. A. J. Balfour. But as a rule Speakers are unanimously elected to office. However, it will be recalled that away back in the days of 1835 a gentleman whose name is well known in this country, who had served as Speaker for seven parliaments, was opposed by Mr. Abercrombie and defeated by a majority of I think eleven in a full house, the votes being 306 and 317—a very full house indeed. The reason was one to which I am presently to refer, and it has great force at this time in this country.

It has been said that the position of chief whip equips one well to discharge the duties of Speaker. There was a speech in the British House of Commons dealing with the question of the Speaker in which it was said that a man may have been so closely connected with politics, so closely identified with party fortunes, that it would be impossible for him after long service in that regard to be an efficient and effective Speaker. However, one of the most eminent of English Speakers was chief whip of his party, and another English Speaker was an assistant whip. Therefore in my judgment it is no bar, although there is high authority for saying that never should the Speakership be looked upon as a reward for services, for technically the speakership is in the gift not of the government but of the house, and the house should not be concerned about rewards for party services, but only with fitness to discharge the high duties and responsibilities of the great office in question.

That being so, I regret to have to say that I am opposed to the election of Mr. Casgrain as speaker of this house. Before I proceed to state my reasons at length I am going to read what the gentleman whom Sir Austen Chamberlain describes as in his judgment the greatest Speaker England ever had, namely the late Lord Peel, conceived to be the qualifications of a great Speaker, when he was elected. Mr. Gladstone was then Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker Peel used these words:

> And I hope, sir, I will make no professions when professions may be so soon tested by experience; but I wish to say this to hon. gentlemen, that I know full well what is the greatest attribute and ornament of that chair. I know how necessary it is for any man, who aspires to fill that great office, to lay aside all that is personal, all that is of party, all that savours of political predilection, and to subordinate everything to the great interests of the house at large. Humbly, sir, trusting in that support, I shall endeavour to maintain and to sustain intact the privileges of this house; to maintain the rules and orders of the house; to maintain not only the written law, but, if I may say so, that unwritten law which should appeal to, as it always does appeal to, the minds and consciences of the gentlemen of the House of Commons. If I have that support, I trust that I may be permitted, not only to carry out the formal rules, but to enforce that unwritten law, and, sir, to promote and to hand down unimpaired, as they have been handed down by those who preceded the late speaker, to those who shall succeed me, the traditions of this house, and, over and above all, its most cherished and inestimable tradition—I mean, sir, that personal courtesy, that interchange of chivalry between member and member, which I believe to be compatible with the most effective party debates and feeling, and which I am sure is one of the oldest, and, I humbly trust, may always be, the most cherished tradition of this great representative assembly. Sir, with these few words—and I trust the house will not think I have unduly trespassed upon its time—I sit down, humbly submitting myself to, and placing myself in the hands and at the disposal of, this house.

That was the speech he made in accepting nomination, and before the house had expressed its will. When he left the chair eleven years later he made a speech to which I have not time this morning to refer, but which I commend to the reading of every hon. member in this chamber.

Bearing in mind what has been said, it is, of course, well known to most of us that for some