

I am sure he will also be very keen to study all the precedents to find out exactly what his powers are. At times, the situation as seen from the Chair is not the same as seen from the floor of the chamber. On the other hand, the Senator knows that in the Senate, the Speaker has the right to take part in debate and to vote.

I believe that during the last session, your predecessor Senator Molgat left the Chair to table his committee's report.

Others before you have done so many times. I noticed that many of our colleagues were surprised to hear the Speaker of the Senate is entitled, under rule 42, to take part in debate, and to vote under rule 49. I wish Senator Asselin a successful "permanent" *pro tempore* speakership.

I wish to thank Senator Molgat who was my Speaker *pro tempore* until Parliament was dissolved. He performed his duties with distinction and great skill.

I would like to quote something interesting from "The Modern Senate of Canada, 1925-63". There is one passage that describes the history of the role of the Speaker and the precedents for allowing the Speaker of the Senate to take part in debate and to vote.

[English]

Unlike the Speaker of the House of Commons, with the Speaker of the Senate there is no suggestion of a requirement of either impartiality or aloofness from debate.

[Translation]

That is rather dangerous. I would not advise it. That was probably in the good old days.

• (1500)

[English]

On those rare occasions when the Speaker wished to address the Senate, he left the chair and spoke from the floor like other members. During the second reading debate of the Trade Mark and Design bill of 1927 Sen. Bostock informed the House that he had strong protests from Vancouver, his home town, about the object of the legislation and urged the postponement of the debate, in order that all interested parties might be heard. Again, in 1945 Sen. King, who, together with Sen. Moraud, represented the Senate in the Canadian delegation at San Francisco, took part in the debate on the resolution approving the United Nations Charter. He was once more brought into the discussion in 1947, when he felt that as Speaker of the Senate he had to reply to an unprecedented attack by Sen. Murdock upon the report of the Senate's Internal Economy committee recommending an increase in the salary of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

The quotation does not say if the Speaker of the Senate then was the Chairman of the Internal Economy Committee, but I will check on that and report back to you, because that might be very interesting to know.

The quotation goes on to state:

Sen. Robertson left his chair twice during his speakership—once in 1954—

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Would the honourable senator receive a question? Was this "unprecedented attack" a verbal attack or a physical attack?

**Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Financial.

**Senator Riel:** It is not stated precisely, Senator Frith.

**Senator Frith:** It does not say whether it was a physical attack or a verbal attack?

**Senator Riel:** No, but if the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod is brought in, I suppose he would defend the Speaker.

In the book I read—and I am not going to quote the complete book—it says that at one time Speakers had difficulties amongst themselves. One Speaker called the other an old viper. At that time there was a Sergeant-at-Arms, and he was obliged to intervene. So, your question was in order, Senator Frith, as is usual.

The quotation goes on to state:

Sen. Robertson left his chair twice during his speakership—once in 1954 to join in paying tribute to the memory of Sen. Dennis, a fellow Nova Scotian, and once in 1955 to take part in the debate on the motion to approve the Protocol on West Germany's accession to NATO. In addition to addressing the House, the Speaker in all cases has a vote; thus, Hardy participated in one division during his short term as Speaker in 1930; Blondin voted in a total of twelve divisions between 1930 and 1935, and Foster and King voted on one bill each while Speakers.

[Translation]

I trust, dear Sir, that the example of your predecessors to whom I have just referred, will encourage you to put your rights and privileges to good use. Of course, and we know that, with your usual discretion, you will use them well.

In my previous speech, I talked about the protocol service of the Secretary of State. I must point out that I am certain there was no ill-will and no lack of sincerity on the part of the officials who came to see me. Their department gives them instructions and they follow them. They are not paid to be experts in parliamentary law. It is up to the Speaker of the Senate to make sure that the rights and prerogatives of the Senate are respected. This is one of his duties and he is empowered to see to it.

Otherwise, the Senate would be left to play a minor role if not actually despised.

In fact, I must say that, later on, I had good relations with one of the protocol officials who came to see me. The pretty lady from Quebec who came to the first meeting never returned. I was sorry about that. I am convinced that, with written and published rules on the rights, privileges and prerogatives of the Speaker of the Senate or even of the Speakers of both houses, our friends from the protocol service of the Secretary of State would understand and co-operate fully.