

appealed from to the House the House frequently, from considerations of loyalty, sustains his decision, and in that way precedents are established. If his ruling were appealed to the Speaker the Speaker might very well overrule the Chairman without any great loss of dignity to the latter.

Mr. BOYS: There is a difficulty in that suggestion. We should have to go a step further, because I am sure my hon. friend would not want the committee to be bereft of all protection. I do not think he would want the Speaker to be absolutely in control of the committee, and for that reason we should have to provide for an appeal from the Speaker to the House in the event of his decision not being satisfactory. My only reason for offering the suggestion is a desire to save some of the time which at present is wasted. However, I have not any deep rooted conviction in the matter, although I do think there is no reason why an appeal from the ruling of the Chairman should not be taken to the committee of the whole House rather than to the House itself. Why should not the committee of the whole House have charge of its own proceedings as has any of the select committees?

Mr. SPEAKER: I take exception to the point of view of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Boys) and the reason is very obvious. Suppose there should happen to be disorder in committee of the whole House and that a member should persist in creating disturbance. I am of course merely supposing a case which fortunately does not occur often. Does my hon. friend think that the ruling of the Chairman and the vote of the committee upon that ruling would be sufficient to put an end to that disorder? I think not. If an appeal is taken from the ruling of the Chairman it must come before the House; and this because of the consequences that might be involved. If the Speaker is obliged to name the member who has been disorderly, the hon. gentleman can see the grave consequences that might ensue. The leader of the House would have to make a motion, the disorderly member would be admonished, and thereupon he would be committed to the care of the Sergeant-at-Arms and brought to the bar of the House. Thereafter, as Mr. Speaker Anglin, one of my predecessors, once observed, "God knows what would happen". This is an old rule which has proved its usefulness in the past, and I think we should leave it to the House to see to the carrying out of such drastic measures as I now suggest, which now and then may

be unavoidable. Otherwise the committee would not have the authority to deal with such a case as I am supposing.

Mr. BOYS: With great respect to His Honour the Speaker, I do not think the situation he refers to could very well arise. Let us take matters as they stand now. Suppose there is a limited attendance in committee and a question is to be appealed: the members are suddenly called in, and although they have not heard a word of what has taken place in committee they are called upon to pass judgment on the question. Those sitting in the committee, on the other hand, are in possession of all the facts; they know what has taken place, and they are in a better position to judge. I am not disturbing the closing sentence of the rule, relating to disorder. I am aware of the rule that provides that any member who is to be named can be named only by the Speaker, and I do not seek to alter that feature. However, as I say, I have no settled conviction on the matter; I was merely making a suggestion with a view to saving time.

Amended rule agreed to.

On amended rule 17C—Speaker to leave chair on Thursdays and Fridays.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It was decided the other day that rules 76, 77 and 78 even if not altered would come in after No. 15. It will be merely a matter of renumbering, but I thought it better to have it on record that these rules would come in in that order.

Amended rule 17C agreed to.

Amended rules 18, 19 and 20 agreed to.

On amended rule 21—No speaker to speak twice.

Mr. IRVINE: I want to offer a suggestion. There has been a slight oversight in the preparation of this amendment.

Sir EUGENE Fiset: This is where the hon. gentleman should not speak at all.

Mr. IRVINE: That applies to my hon. friend as well. I sympathize with the desire to curtail the length of speeches to forty minutes, but that is not what I want to call the attention of the committee to. The new rule provides:

No member, except the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, or a minister moving a government order—

The CHAIRMAN: My hon. friend is speaking of the new rule; amended rule 21 is now before the committee. Shall amended rule 21 carry?