

is dissatisfied with his decision, he has the remedy of having it decided upon, without further debate, by a majority in this House, because this House is master of its own procedure. As I have said, the older the case the better the law, and I will now for a few moments deal with the case in 1810 which was referred to by my hon. friend. Take the 1810 case; what do the journals of the British House of Commons say?

The House resolved itself into committee, Mr. Fuller returned,—

Remember there had been a report before and Mr. Fuller had been ejected.

Mr. Fuller returned, and was violent and disorderly; Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and ordered the Sergeant to do his duty.

Mr. Fuller was accordingly taken out by the Sergeant-at-Arms. Where is the report from the committee in that case? Now we go back to the old case, which is abundant authority for this Speaker, or any other Speaker, to act under circumstances similar to those in which he acted, because it is a precedent unchallenged and unquestioned. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says that May points out that the action of the Speaker on that occasion has not been duplicated since. But May does not say that situations have arisen on all fours with the situation that arose on that occasion, and therefore it is impossible to say that the Speaker was outside his rights in acting as he did. The fact that this precedent has stood unquestioned in any House during all those years, so far as I know, is prima facie evidence that it is a precedent on which the Speaker of the British House of Commons, or the Speaker of this House can act in dealing with disorders as they arise, because it was previous to 1867. What was that case? May says:

On the 10th May, 1675, a serious disturbance arose in a Committee of the Whole House.—

And the Speaker took the Chair. The Speaker stated that it was to bring the House into order again, to discharge the first function that he has, because order is essential to discussion, and to the conduct of business. He acted on the principle to which I referred at the outset. It is a mistake to deal with a matter of this kind on narrow grounds; you must deal with it on broad grounds; you must consider what is the function of the Speaker. His function is to keep order, and acting on that principle, and on that broad principle which I stated, the Speaker in that case announced that it was to bring the House into order again that he took the Chair. Then he stated:

Though not according to order, he had taken the Chair.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds)

That is, he acted according to a special rule, but in the exercise of his function as Speaker to keep order when the House was out of order.

No other entry appears in the journal than that 'Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair'; but the same report adds that though 'some gentlemen excepted against his coming to the chair,'—

Just as some gentlemen except to your action, Mr. Speaker, a week ago Saturday night.

—the doing it was generally approved—

As it is generally approved here.

—as the only expedient to suppress the disorder.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend ignores rule 14 altogether.

Mr. WHITE: I thought I had dealt with rule 14. I have dealt with the general authority of the Speaker according to the precedent of 1675, a precedent unquestioned, under which the Speaker—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I agree that that would bind us now were it not for our rule.

Mr. WHITE: Rule 14 says that, if it is specifically provided for, then the rules and usages of the British House of Commons would not apply. Rule 14 says:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House shall maintain order in the committee.

Very good; but supposing the Chairman of the committee is unable to maintain order. That is what happened.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then he had better report to the House.

Mr. WHITE: Supposing he does not report; are you going to have the House thrown into grave disorder for hours because the Chairman of the committee is unable to maintain order, or does not report. It is the duty of the Speaker on general grounds, as I have said, to maintain order. Sitting, as he had a perfect right to sit, in the committee, and observing what was going on, the Speaker saw the Chairman of the committee practically threatened with physical force.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. WHITE: I saw the Chairman of the committee practically threatened with physical force. I am stating what I saw, and what every hon. member in this House saw.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise again to a point of order. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is entirely unwarranted in making that statement. I have already stated in this House that I had no thought whatever of making any assault upon the Chairman.