

that in ours. The position of Speaker in Great Britain is entirely different from the position of Speaker in this country. A Speaker in Great Britain is elected and is continued in office. He is non-partisan; he is in no way affiliated or associated with either political party. Conditions which prevail in the British House of Commons are vastly different from those which prevail in the Canadian House of Commons. With us, on the advent of a new Administration, a Speaker is selected, who is one of the Government's supporters and who is associated with the party in power. I am not complaining of that; I am only mentioning the fact. So far as lies within his power, he may seek to be immune from association with either of the political parties; but there is no use disguising the fact that the party which appoints a Speaker looks to him as one of its own, as a part of the Administration, as it were. I am not speaking of present conditions merely; I am speaking as well of conditions which have prevailed in the past. To attempt to apply an English rule, which is based on entirely different conditions, to conditions which prevail in the Canadian House of Commons, is simply to attempt a misfit; it is an impossibility; it presents an anomaly. The point is this: Can there not be some understanding in order that difficulties, which have arisen in the past and which may possibly arise in the future, may be avoided? There certainly should be some definite understanding as to what rules shall govern procedure in this House. That is a very important question. If the Chairman of the committee is but a donkey engine of the Speaker and subject to his direction, then rule 14 is entirely nugatory and should be repealed at once. It is absolutely obsolete, if the circumstances could present itself of a Chairman in the Chair with a committee in session and of the Speaker in the Chair, and the Speaker directing the Chairman to do this or that. A report must first be presented from the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to the Speaker, who receives that report and submits it to the House. It is then for the House to take action. If some member has been named in committee or has been reported as being disorderly or as acting in contempt of the Chair, the Chairman makes a report in detail to the Speaker. Under our rule the Speaker may be called to the Chair for that purpose. The report of the Chairman is then read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and it is for the House to deal with that recalcitrant or disorderly member. In the English House of Commons, a Chairman of a committee has the power of the Speaker with regard to an offending member of a committee, and he can take action in the

matter. Under those circumstances, without wishing to deal with the matter from a party standpoint, and only with the desire that conditions and circumstances shall be exposed in order that future proceedings of Committees of the Whole and of the House of Commons itself shall be governed and that difficulties may be avoided, do I attempt to present the matter before you, Sir, on this occasion. I could perhaps recall to the minds of hon. members circumstances which transpired within the last fortnight in their presence. I wish to do that, only in so far as it is necessary with a view of placing the matter in its true light and in order that a remedy may be afforded and that future occurrences of a similar character may be avoided. Something might be said in favour of the usages of Parliament prevailing, had we no such rule as No. 14.

I sought to bring this matter up merely for discussion, not contemplating, nor having any desire to censure anybody as to anything that had transpired in the past. But, Mr. Speaker, you, very properly, called my attention to a rule that you thought prevailed with respect to the necessity of giving notice of motion. You quoted from Bourinot, page 280. Referring to the Speaker, Bourinot says:

He decides only when questions actually arise, and not in anticipation. If a member wishes to challenge his act or conduct he must proceed in the usual way by giving notice of motion on the subject.

Bourinot cites as his authority, the English 'Hansard,' Third Series, Vol. 277, pages 810 to 812. But the authority thence cited, in my humble opinion, does not bear out the dictum of Bourinot or the conclusion drawn by him. The circumstances of the case referred to do not warrant the statement that 'when a member wishes to challenge any act or the conduct of the Speaker, he must proceed in the usual way by giving notice of motion on the subject.' The case referred to was one that occurred in March, 1886. The question was one of privilege, raised by Sir H. Drummond Wolff. I shall not read the details of the case or the circumstances, but the following is part of that debate:

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member asks me whether the answer given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a question put by the hon. and learned member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) does not amount to a breach of privilege.

Sir H. Drummond Wolff: No, Sir, that was not my question.

Mr. Speaker: I am bound to say that the question should have been put to me at the time the answer was made; and I have to observe that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his answer, referred to a treasury minute bearing on the matter which has been laid