

not that I asked the hon. gentleman to postpone his motion. I intended to move the very next day for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker, but as I was apprehensive that hon. gentlemen might say: Well, the leader of the House has got the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) to postpone his motion in order to give him an opportunity of moving for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. I have deferred it until now, but I will now give the hon. gentleman and the House notice that it is my intention to move to-morrow for the appointment of a Chairman of Committees.

Mr. BLAKE. You must give notice of that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not necessary to give notice.

Mr. BLAKE. I think so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it has been decided otherwise.

Mr. BLAKE. It could not have been decided otherwise as yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it will be so decided.

Mr. BLAKE. That I dare say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure that it will be decided rightly, and if it is decided rightly it must be decided that this motion may be made without notice. I am altogether opposed to the motion of the hon. gentleman, and I call upon the House to reject it.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the hon. gentleman for not having taken advantage of the postponement of this motion, which I am glad he did not do. While commenting upon the fact that the Chairman of Committees was not yet appointed, I drew the attention of the First Minister and the House to the words of the Standing Order, which said, not as the First Minister would like to imply, that the Chairman of Committees should be appointed when he is needed, but that he should be appointed as soon as the Address in answer to His Excellency's speech is agreed to. This shows no connection with his duties as Chairman of Committees, and has nothing to do with the delay to which the First Minister has alluded. As regards the remark of the First Minister that the office was created only after the subject had received full consideration and full discussion, I think the hon. gentleman, in making that statement, is going a little beyond the fact.

Mr. SPRAKER. Hon. gentlemen will please keep order. I have no means of discovering who is making that noise, but it ought not to be done.

Mr. FISHER. I have no desire to waste the time of the House, but after the remarks of the First Minister I think I am in order in replying in a few words. I was alluding to the way in which the Deputy Speaker's office was created, and when the First Minister said it was done after full consideration and with deliberate intention, I think that he was going a little beyond the fact. While in England when the Deputy speakership was instituted there was very full consideration of the question and a full discussion, and the report of a committee which took evidence and examined a large number of the leading parliamentarians of the country, we know perfectly well that that action was taken here without any investigation on the part of the House or any of its committees. The First Minister took the responsibility for the action taken after I suppose consulting his colleagues, and probably consulting his own party, but without consulting the House. I do not consider that can fairly be called full consideration and investigation. It may be partisan investigation, it may be partial consideration; but I do not think it can be considered to be full investigation on the part of the House

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of Commons or Parliament. The hon. First Minister also alluded, as he did when he first brought the question before this House, to the unfortunate affliction of a former Speaker. I am glad to believe that the Speaker of the last Parliament has escaped any such disastrous result, and I believe that if we were to follow the rule adopted by the First Minister at the opening of this Parliament, namely, that the same gentleman should not be twice consecutively chosen Speaker of the House, such disastrous results would be very unlikely to occur. I understand Mr. Cockburn, the Speaker alluded to, was twice consecutively Speaker of this House, and it is evident that at the close of the first Parliament he did not consider that he was so ill as to be unwilling to receive a second appointment. Had his health been impaired and a Deputy Speaker required, then would have been the time to have appointed this additional officer. But that course was not taken until last Parliament. I cannot believe that the First Minister had any conception that the Session was going to last so long—or that the sittings were going to be so tiresome and so long—unless, indeed, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were aware that the iniquitous contents of the Franchise Bill would be stoutly opposed by hon. members on this side of the House, and they prepared at the very commencement, before the Bill was known to members of the Opposition, for a prolonged struggle, and they therefore believed it to be necessary to establish this office to provide for the contingency they expected, and which really did come about. I believe the argument of the First Minister is no justification for this office and I trust the House may be so far independent of the leader of the Government on this occasion as to support my motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, when the Government proposed to appoint a Deputy Speaker, the House did not oppose the motion; on the contrary, it seemed to be their desire that the appointment should be made, and I do not think that we have ever had any occasion to complain of the fact that there was a second officer to preside at the proceedings of the House. Your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, would certainly not have been able to perform his duties had he not had a deputy to fill the Chair on more than one occasion, and now that the House has decided to have this officer, I do not see anything in what the hon. member told us when he made his motion nor in what he has just told us, which might induce the House to adopt his motion. As the hon. Premier has said a while ago, when the Speaker was obliged to choose an ordinary member of this House to discharge the duties of Chairman of Committees of the whole House, he indiscriminately took a member from one side of the House or the other, and none of these chairmen knew the rules of the House as well as the Speaker knows them, or as well as the Deputy Speaker knew them when he discharged these duties during the two last Sessions. Surely we the old members of Parliament should remember the scenes which often took place when the Speaker called upon an ordinary member of the House—a member who was not the same for all the committees, since it was the privilege of the Speaker to choose a member from either side of the House, and, as a rule, he did not always choose the same member—to discharge these duties. We have seen, on many occasions, members of this House rather deficient in respect for the Chairman of the Committee, and scenes which were certainly not a credit to the House of Commons. But on the other hand, I must say that under the new system inaugurated by the appointment of a permanent Chairman of Committees, we have seen no repetition of such scenes. The Chairman of these Committees had evidently, in the opinion of most of hon. members, the same powers and the same authority as the Speaker, and was consequently listened to and obeyed with more respect than the old Chairmen of Committees. Under these circum-