

Mr. MACDONALD: After the committee had reported progress.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that in a moment. (Reading):

—for subsequently when a member who, for disorderly conduct, had been ordered into custody, returned into the House, during the sitting of a committee, in a violent and disorderly manner, upon a report of progress, the Speaker resumed the Chair, and ordered the Sergeant to do his duty.

Hon. gentlemen will look the records of that case in vain to find that progress was reported.

Mr. MACDONALD: Take the next case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, we will take this case. The case referred to is the Fuller case, which occurred in the British House in 1810, when an hon. member of that House became disorderly in committee. There was an excuse for him as the records of the case clearly show; but he became disorderly in committee, and was reported to the House in the usual way. That was when the report occurred. Then he was named and ordered to withdraw, and the committee resumed its business. After the committee resumed its business on the 27th of February, 1810, and again became a Committee of the Whole:

The hon. member in question rushed from the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms and forcibly entered the House in a disorderly and riotous manner. Then Mr. Speaker resumed the chair without a report, and ordered the Sergeant to do his duty.

That is the case here exactly. Will any hon. member say there was nothing like that? Will any hon. member argue that if one individual enters this House while it is in committee and thereby creates a disturbance, and that that gives the Speaker authority to resume the Chair to establish order again, in another case, where not only one, but say fifty members of the committee became riotous and disorderly, there is no authority at all for you Mr. Speaker to take the Chair? The very circumstances of the case are such as to make the report of the Chairman a matter of practical impossibility, and it is by virtue of these extraordinary circumstances that the Speaker is justified in such cases in taking the Chair. A full report of that case is in 'Hansard' of 1810, on the 27th of February, and the discussion took place on the day following the 1st of March. The report in May goes on to quote another case, not I think as clearly applicable to this case, although apparently from May it is applicable. This case occurred in 1815.

Mr. DEVLIN: In the case to which my hon. friend has referred, did the Speaker

not simply come into the Chair to adjourn the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. If the hon. gentleman will read the report, he will see that there was no adjournment in either case. They went on with the business.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was not that a case of the Speaker coming in and naming a member?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, nor did Mr. Speaker come into this Chamber to name any hon. member. He came into the Chair to preserve or restore order, and if hon. gentlemen had had regard to this purpose, there would have been no need to name any hon. member.

Mr. MURPHY: That was not what Mr. Speaker said was his reason for taking the Chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that later. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) would hardly ask this House to reverse the action taken by Mr. Speaker if there was ample justification for it, no matter what justification might at the time have been alleged. I read at page 367:

So also, when during the sitting of the committee on the Corn Bill, 6th March, 1815, tumultuous proceedings took place outside, and one member complained that the House was surrounded by a military force, and another that he had been beset by a mob, on the report of progress, the Speaker resumed the Chair, and, the matter having been considered, the committee was resumed.

That is not a case that is on all fours with the other two cases quoted; but the other two cases are amply sufficient to justify the action of Mr. Speaker in resuming the Chair, on the occasion in question.

Now, it is argued that, even granted that you were within your rights and that you were acting in the clear pursuance of your duty in so resuming the Chair, you exceeded your authority in ordering the Chairman to put the question. What are the facts? The Chairman of the committee had risen to put the question, was about to put the question and he was on the point of being forcibly prevented from putting it by hon. members of this House either by force of arms or by force of voice.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman's statement is entirely unfounded. There is no justification whatever for the statement that he was being prevented by force. We were appealing to his reason and we were endeavouring to make him hear and understand that a member was on the floor of the House desiring to address the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was that an attempt was being made to prevent him from putting the question either by force of arms or force of voice. I was under the impression that both were resorted to, but