

difference between the power of the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons and the power of the Speaker of the English House of Commons. The Speaker of the English House of Commons has to-day power which the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons has not. If a member is disorderly in this House, the Speaker can name him, but he can do nothing more; and, having named him, it is for the leader of the House to take action as to the manner in which the member named by Mr. Speaker should be dealt with. The Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons has no such power as that given to the Speaker of the British House of Commons. He cannot order the removal of a member; he can simply name him and then let the House decide. The anecdote is well known of Speaker Abbott, I think it was, who said that he had threatened Mr. So-and-So, without naming him, and when he was asked afterwards what would have happened if he had named him, he said, 'The Lord only knows.' He could not say himself what would have happened. The member might have been censured; he might have been expelled; he might have been suspended. That matter was in the power of the House. I go further than the argument of my hon. friend: order must be preserved. When the Speaker leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of the Whole, there is an authority sitting at the head of the Committee; there is somebody who is clothed with absolutely the same authority, as the Speaker to maintain order namely, the Chairman. The rule is very emphatic on this point. Rule 14 says:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House shall maintain order in the committee, deciding all questions of order subject to an appeal to the House.

That is the power of the Chairman, just as the Speaker has the same power to maintain order subject also to an appeal to the House. What would be the consequence if the Speaker could say to the Chairman at any time: You do not understand your duty; let me take charge of the business of the House? There might be very serious confusion, authority against authority, mind against mind, and judgment against judgment. My theory, and it is the theory of Parliament, is that in all these matters neither has any authority over the other. The Speaker has no authority over the Chairman of the Committee. I say most emphatically—and I should be surprised if this opinion were contradicted—that the Speaker has no power to take away authority from the Chairman. The Chairman is the umpire; he is there to maintain order to the best of his judgment and ability. When he has done that, he has discharged his full duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

If he finds that he cannot control his Committee and that disorder prevails, he reports to the House, and it is for the House to come in, to interfere, to pass judgment, to give such orders as it thinks should be given.

If we keep these principles clearly before us, no bad effects can be produced. My hon. friend wants me to discuss what has taken place in the Committee. This is not the time to do that. For the moment the only question on which debate has been started is to ascertain what is the authority of Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I would say, what I said at the beginning, that for my part I bear testimony to the impartial motive of Mr. Speaker; at the same time, I vindicate, as a humble member of Parliament, the right and privilege of this House to be guided, and to be guided only, by rules which have come down to us from the ages.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend has discussed this subject in a very calm and dispassionate manner; and I think he had very properly omitted any allusion to the particular incident out of which the debate arose. He has paid a very just tribute to the impartiality and fairness of Your Honour, in which I am sure all members on both sides of the House concur. The question for discussion really comes down to the bald technical question as to whether or not the Speaker may under any circumstances resume the Chair by his own authority when the House is in Committee of the Whole, and under what circumstances may he do so. That is the point which my friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) raised. I think that he initiated the discussion in a very proper manner and spirit, assuming that it was desirable to discuss it at all.

Before coming to that, I should like to say that my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) saw fit to make some allusions to myself which I must mention for the purpose of removing any misunderstanding on his part. He suggested that I had attempted to dictate to the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Robi-doux). I have looked through 'Hansard' and I cannot find any report of my remarks, but the hon. gentleman is correct to this extent, although it does not seem to have been reported that I did say to the hon. member for Kent that I thought that he had received all the assistance that could reasonably be given for the purpose of enabling him to come to a conclusion. I should like to correct my hon. friend in one respect. He intimated to the House that immediately thereafter