

Deputy Speaker was first chosen, can recollect the fact that, in consequence of the long sittings of the committee, the one hon. gentleman, whose duty it was to fill that position, was and must necessarily have been exhausted, and found his patience and his physical endurance tested beyond his power to sustain the test. It would be obvious that, were it within your competency to call upon any member to fulfil that duty, the case might be different, but when one member has to perform that duty, I can well understand the delicacy of Mr. Speaker in calling upon other hon. members, when that one member is paid a salary for performing that duty. If we had no such official, and if you, Sir, were at liberty to call upon any member whose experience is sufficient to justify his filling that position, no hon. member would have that feeling. There is another reason why I think we should refrain from continuing this office. The Government of the day are creating new offices in the civil government. There is a new Minister of Trade and Commerce to be created with a large salary, there is a proposition to create a Solicitor General with a large salary, and in the Public Accounts and in the *Official Gazette* we find that the expenditure has become alarmingly great. We believe that any officer who can be dispensed with ought to be dispensed with, and I have not yet heard any argument showing that it is necessary that this particular office should be continued. I suppose the First Minister and those who were responsible for the creation and for the continuance of this office, will say that we are adopting the English procedure, that we are following the example of that Parliament which we take for our model, and that, as they find it necessary to have a Deputy Speaker, it is necessary for us to follow their example. In the debate when the First Minister proposed to establish this office, he referred to the fact that in various other colonies there were Deputy Speakers who had large salaries. I think the circumstances are different. I am not going into an elaborate argument in reference to the existence of a Deputy Speaker in England. We can refer to our own experience in this matter. We can look back to the eighteen years which elapsed before the institution of this office, in order to show that we can get on perfectly well without this official, that it is unnecessary in our Parliament, and we need not take the example of any other legislature or country. I trust the desire will be shown by gentlemen sitting on both sides of this House to curtail our expenditure and to do away with what is unnecessary and decrease the burdens on the tax payers of the country, and that, therefore, we may hope that an end will be put to this leak, small though it may be, but occurring in regard to an office which I believe to be entirely and absolutely unnecessary. As the First Minister has not proposed a gentleman to fill this position and as it is incumbent on him to propose some one to fill that position, I hope he may have changed his mind and that he does not feel the same desire as was felt by the Ministers at the time to propose the filling of this office. I trust that this motion will be accepted by both sides of the House, not only by those who have experience of the past and have seen something of parliamentary procedure here, but by the new members who, coming fresh from their constituencies, will feel that they will fulfil the wishes of a large portion of the people of this country by showing their desire to economise and to carry on the business of Parliament with as little expense and as little formality as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure the House will not adopt this retrograde step suggested by the hon. gentleman in his motion. The last Parliament, after full consideration, and with the general acceptance of the majority, came to the conclusion that the establishment of this permanent officer, with all the powers and duties con-

ferred upon him was necessary for the efficient performance of our duties as members of Parliament, and for the purposes, in the first place, of assisting and protecting the Speaker from the consequences of having no such support, and in the next place, to have an officer under the supervision of yourself, Sir, armed with the same powers, and called upon, by holding office permanently, to pay the same attention to the rules and practice of Parliament as the Speaker himself. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman says, that when the debate on this Deputy Speakership took place, I alluded to the practice of the English Parliament. It may be well said, I admit, that there may be a great deal more business there, that Parliament sits much longer in England than it does in Canada, and that, therefore, it is straining the point a good deal in the matter of imitation, to adopt the notion simply because it is English. But, Sir, we pay great respect to the practice in England, and they have found it absolutely necessary to have such an officer. I think any one who has watched the progress of parliamentary proceedings of late days in England, must see that whether that Parliament sits for three months or for six, the appointment of an officer of that kind, the Speaker in every respect, I may say, except in rank, and supposed to possess the same qualifications, supposed to devote himself to the study of the practice of Parliament, and to train himself to the overseeing, in fact, not only of the House, but when the Speaker is out of the Chair, the innumerable cases in which the House is in Committee of the Whole—I say, all these things show the absolute necessity for a Deputy Speaker. And that necessity, as the hon. gentleman reminds me, was felt in our sister colonies, situated in the same conditions, very much as we are, with sessions not longer than ours. I think that in almost every one of the Australian colonies, they have found it necessary to appoint a deputy, with the powers of Speaker, and holding the position of permanent Chairman of Committees. All the colonies in Australia, and I think New Zealand as well, have such an officer. You may remember, Sir, how much the first Speaker suffered from the fact of not having such an officer. Mr. Cockburn, in fact, contracted the disease of which he died from being obliged to preside over long sittings for so long a period of time. And then we were obliged, as it will be remembered, to pass an Act for the purpose of giving additional powers in the way of having an officer to sit in the Chair during the enforced absence of the Speaker from ill-health or otherwise. But, Sir, it is quite clear that the casual appointment of a member to sit on a particular occasion, to sit in committee when a particular Bill is before the House, is not satisfactory. He has not of necessity given any particular attention to the practice of Parliament, it is not his duty to make himself acquainted with the practice of Parliament, and it would be improper and unwise to clothe with the authority of Speaker a casual Chairman of Committees appointed from time to time, varying every time, and therefore in no way fit to assume your position and have your authority, or to have the control or influence with the House of Commons which such an officer should have. The mere statement that the very moderate allowance given to the Deputy Speaker should be an impediment to such an officer if he is wanted, I think is too penny-wise to be worth consideration. I have no doubt that the House will sustain the opinion so strongly expressed in the last Parliament, of the propriety and expediency, and the importance of having such an officer. The hon. gentleman says that the Deputy Speaker ought to have been appointed before. Well, he will be appointed as soon as he is wanted. He was not wanted really until the committees that had been appointed had got to work, and until this House was called upon to go into Committee of the Whole. But, I tell my hon. friend that he would have been appointed before we went into committee at all if it were