

from authoritative documents, books or other printed publications, used to enrich the form of one's speech or to support or found upon them an argument. These extracts must not contravene any of our rules of order because no language can be heard in quotation which would be disorderly if spoken. Bourinot, at page 336, and Beauchesne in Citation 265 of his 3rd Edition have summarized our practice further by adding:

"It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a Member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House. See No. 259, *ante*.

No one has illustrated the importance of this rule of practice better than the late Viscount Bennett, when he was Prime Minister of this country. As reported at page 3608 of *Debates*, Vol. 4, for June 1, 1934, he said:

"There is a well-established rule that editorials are not to be read, for the reason that you cannot introduce another member into Parliament. There are 245 Members of Parliament, and debate assumes that members make arguments for the purpose of trying to induce their colleagues to get their point of view. You cannot introduce another member into the House, and that is what is done when you introduce a newspaper's editorial for the purpose".

6. Any attempt to enforce the rule by the Chair would be of little value if it were to provoke a retort such as this, for instance: "I am reading a portion of my speech, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not reading it completely". Or, if it were to provoke a prolonged argument between Members. I will do my best to call the violators to order, but because, as Redlich says, (Page 64, Vol. 3) "The Speaker sits enthroned on high in lonely majesty", it cannot be expected that I will observe all the offenders myself. I shall rely on the co-operation of all honourable Members, particularly those seated near the Member who has the floor. I propose first to give a warning to the violator of the rule.

In order to further facilitate the enforcement, I submit that authority should be given to the Speaker to silence a Member who persists in violating the rule. If it meets with the approval of the House, I believe, that through a broader interpretation of our Standing Order 34 (2), direction may be given to a Member who persists in reading his speech, after having been called to order, to discontinue his speech and resume his seat; and if then the Member disregards the authority of the Chair, the Speaker shall name him.

In considering these suggestions, some honourable Members may feel that we would be going from one extreme to the other and the rule would be too severe. Experience has shown, much to our detriment, that a rule against the reading of speeches must be severe if it is to be worthwhile having and enforceable. We all know that human nature being what it is, the human nature of all honourable Members and the human nature of the Speaker, many of our rules are not observed to the letter. A severe rule on the reading of speeches is one of these rules which are capable of flexibility, much being left to our discretion and judgment, yours and mine. Without the positive support of honourable Members no rule of ours can be properly administered.

In the debate just concluded, namely, the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, great latitude has been given to all honourable Members.

From now on, however, I urge all honourable Members to express their own views in their own words.

The successful application and enforcement of the rule depend on the teamwork of all honourable Members and the Chair. There must be a determination on the part of each individual Member and on the part of all honourable Members collectively to have this important rule of debate respected as