

mace, which will lie on the Table whilst he is in the Chair, and the House is consequently in session.

Then, with regard to the duties of the Speaker :

It is the duty of the Speaker to preside over all the deliberations of the House, and to enforce its rules and orders of which he is the guardian. He announces the business of the House in the order in which it should be taken up. . . . He receives and puts to the House, all motions that may be proposed by members in accordance with the rules and usages of parliament. He receives messages from the Senate &c., &c.

I claim that in the absence of any specific provision in our rules there is no authority whereby any member of the House or any official can call another member to the Chair, and that there is no person charged with that duty except the Speaker himself, or the deputy speaker in the absence of the speaker. I claim that when a person is appointed as a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, when he discharges such duties, he not being called to the Chair of the House, his authority ended there. It is said that where our rules do not specifically provide for carrying on the business of the House we may fall back upon the English rule bearing on the subject, but so far as I can find there is no English rule which would justify what has been done in this case. I desire to ask whether the Speaker has or has not the authority to delegate his powers to some one privately? Even though that can be done by the Speaker, I draw attention to the fact that in this case it was not done by the Speaker but by a minister of the Crown, who certainly had no authority for doing so. I draw the attention of the Speaker and of the House to this matter so that we may know what is the rule, and so that we may not follow this as a precedent in the future. If it be necessary to make some provision for such a contingency, we should make the provision and not go on in this loose and irregular way. As I have said, I can find no rule for this even in the rules of the imperial House of Commons, and in doing what has been done we apparently have gone beyond the rule of the imperial parliament itself. The rule also says that that motion for adjournment having been made by the senior member of the government present, the Speaker shall put it from the Chair and declare it carried and the sergeant at arms shall precede the Speaker with the mace, which is the sign of authority, out of the chamber. That was not done in the present case because the Speaker was not present, and while the sergeant at arms carried the mace to the Speaker's quarters there was no Speaker to follow him as the member who occupied the Chair went off about his business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Horrible.

Mr. SPROULE. I draw attention to this so that we may not get into the habit of doing what we have no warrant for under the rules of this House. I beg to move the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I am afraid that the motive of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is not so much to preserve the integrity of our rules as to ventilate a grudge against us all because we did not go on sitting on Saturday and Sunday, for had we sat on Sunday morning he might have an opportunity to address this House on some religious question just as he instructs us on secular questions during all the week days.

I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the English rules have been embodied in our own rules and if he will look at the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chap. 14, he will find the following :

1. Whenever the Speaker of the House of Commons, from illness or other cause, finds it necessary to leave the Chair during any part of the sittings of the said House, on any day, he may call upon the chairman of committees, or, in his absence upon any member of this House, to take the Chair and to act as Deputy Speaker during the remainder of such day, unless the Speaker shall himself resume the Chair before the close of the sittings for that day.

There is no doubt as to the right of the Speaker to call some one to the Chair, and as to the legality of any act done by the House under the presidency of the member who takes the place of the Speaker in his absence. Under rule 3, the Deputy Speaker has exactly the same right as the Speaker. The rule says that every act done by the Deputy Speaker is as valid as if it was done by the Speaker himself. Therefore, the Deputy Speaker has a perfect right to call any member of the House to take the Chair. The anomaly of the Deputy Speaker presiding over the Committee of the Whole and then acting as Speaker occurs every day. It is well understood that his personality changes for the time being, though happily it does not change entirely, and he has a perfect right to call any member of the House to act as chairman of the committee in presenting the report, and to take from that member the report of the committee while he acts as speaker of the House. Therefore, so far as that point is concerned, I think it is well settled.

Without being too personal, I would remind the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that one who lives in a house of glass should not throw stones at his neighbour, even at the Speaker. If the hon. gentleman is so anxious to observe all the rules of the House, not only in the spirit, but in the letter, I would remind him of another rule which I confess is not observed by every member of the House. That is rule 18, which says :

Every member is bound to attend the service of the House unless leave of absence has been given him by the House.