

North Essex (Mr. Sutherland), who during the last parliament had discharged the duties of Speaker with signal ability and success and to the satisfaction of all parties in this House, as to whether or not it would be advisable for us to adopt the British practice. My hon. friend from North Essex represented to me that unless radical changes were made in our method of procedure and in the manner in which we treated the Speaker, whilst the honour was great the sacrifices which the incumbent of the office had to make were still greater. The assiduity which is expected of the Speaker in the discharge of his duties, especially when we consider the increasing length of the sessions of parliament in later years, has made it impossible for the Speaker of this House to attend to his private affairs and has forced him to practically disassociate himself from all other avocations. Again, reverting to the English practice, I may observe that it has been the practice of the House of Commons in England, not only by a long series of precedents, but by actual statute, to, in many ways, make the office of Speaker equal to a judicial office. In fact, the Speaker of the English House of Commons is treated as a judge of the land. He is expected to devote himself entirely to his office; he is the recipient of the large salary of £5,000 per annum, and should he resign office he is given a pension of £4,000 a year, with a peerage added. Of course we cannot give a peerage to our late speaker; we might perhaps give him a senatorship, but that has not been the practice up to the present time. We certainly cannot give Mr. Speaker a very large salary, and as to a pension I have a very vivid memory that pensions are not popular in this country. It is, therefore, not a tradition of the House of Commons of Canada to re-elect Mr. Speaker for a second term, but it is a tradition of our Houses and it is the fitness of things that the member of the Houses who ranks next to the Speaker in the previous parliament should be called to the chair. We are fortunate that in the Deputy Speaker during last parliament, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Charles Marcil) we have available a gentleman of the highest character, and who discharged the duties of Deputy Speaker to the satisfaction of all of us who were here last parliament. I, therefore, have great pleasure in proposing to the House the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Charles Marcil) as Speaker. At the opening of the first session of last parliament the hon. gentleman was elected to the deputy speakership, and as chairman of Committees of the Whole, and as occupying the chair itself on frequent occasions, I think I can appeal to the judgment of hon. gentlemen who were members of the last parliament that Mr. Marcil discharged those duties with grace, with dig-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

nity, with fairness, with impartiality and with marked ability. Hon. gentlemen who were members of this House during last parliament will agree with me that my hon. friend (Mr. Charles Marcil) has been eminently endowed by nature for the high position. We know that by experience he has accumulated a vast store of parliamentary knowledge, and we have every reason, therefore, to believe that in the discharge of the duties of the office, to which I hope he will be called by the unanimous voice of this House, he will give satisfaction to both sides, holding even the scales of justice between contending parties without favour to any and with fear of none. I move, seconded by Mr. Paterson:

That Charles Marcil, Esq., member representing the electoral district of Bonaventure do take the chair of this House as Speaker.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Flint: The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has described very fully and very accurately the position of the First Commoner in the Imperial House at London. I am inclined to share the regret he has expressed that the traditions which have surrounded the office of Speaker in that House have not in all respects been adhered to in this House. I refer to the continuance of the Speaker in office from one parliament to another. I recollect very well being in Great Britain in 1895, when there was a great deal of discussion in the British press as to whether or not Sir William Court Gully, who had been elected as Speaker in a previous parliament, should be continued in that office under the Conservative administration which had come into power in 1895. There were a great many arguments pro and con. Mr. Gully had held the Speakership only a very short time. But, in the end, the immemorial traditions prevailed, and he was re-elected without any opposition whatever. I, of course, realize that, in this country, our conditions are somewhat different in many respects to which I need not further allude. And, possibly, it has been in view of these that it has not been regarded as practicable to carry out in every way the traditions of the Imperial House. But I trust that in another respect, in respect of the dignity which surrounds the office, and the impartiality which must be observed by any Speaker if he is to retain the respect and maintain control of the House, I trust that in all these we have not at any time been behind—at least, not very much behind—the traditions of the Imperial House.

The Prime Minister has referred to the nature of the office of Speaker. It has been described in a recent very elaborate historical account of the British House of Commons and the procedure therein as predominantly a judicial office. And it is a judicial office. The Speaker must have re-