

Defence Production Act

point that the Prime Minister, whose name appears on the order paper, as the mover of this bill, should be here and address the house on this bill, I want to remind him with all deference that the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), at page 4513 of *Hansard*, expressed a similar contention; the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe), at page 4540, made the same point; the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), when he made his remarks last evening, began by his appeal to the Prime Minister to address the house on this bill; the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), at page 4539, did the same thing. That is the list only of those members whose speeches I have read so far.

I would ask the hon. member to refrain from repeating. It may be that he has a totally different argument from all those we have heard so far, but it is my duty to remind the hon. member and others who may follow him in this debate that there is a standing order, standing order 40, subsection 2, which forbids repetition either of one's own arguments or arguments used by others in the same debate. Having said that, I shall ask the hon. member to bear these remarks in mind.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Dickey: Not the same speech all over again.

Mr. Fleming: I take it that it is a point of order you have referred to. May I respectfully submit to you that standing order 40 (2) contemplates that there should not be undue repetition of an argument. But the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) and the hon. members who have participated earlier in this debate, to whose remarks you have made reference, are making an appeal and a demand. It is not a matter of repeating an argument; it is a matter of making an appeal and a demand that the Prime Minister, in whose name this resolution stands, should come to the house and give his reasons for it. With great respect, in my submission to you there is nothing in standing order 40 (2) that this type of appeal and demand offends.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Another 101-minute speech.

Mr. Fleming: It is a matter of repeating an appeal and a demand.

Mr. Speaker: No matter how you put it, it is repetition. The hon. member for Eglinton, in making the appeal, advanced certain reasons for doing so. All the other members to whose remarks I have referred have done

likewise. This is exactly what the hon. member for Brandon-Souris has just announced. He says he is making an appeal, and he is going to give the reasons for it. After we have had the appeal and the reasons the appeal was made exposed by five members already, it is a question of judgment.

As I had occasion to say earlier, it is difficult to administer this rule, but the hon. gentleman himself, if he reflects on the wording of it, will probably ask himself, as I do, at what point does the repetition become repetitive and tedious so that it constitutes the next step, which is persistence in repetition. Then, if that obtains, the next step is so grave that I may direct the hon. member to discontinue his speech; and if then the member still continues to speak, I have the power to name him. So repetition of one's own arguments or arguments used by others in debate is a very serious matter.

At this moment, having asked the hon. member to keep in mind what I have indicated to him, I am satisfied he will continue his speech without repeating the arguments made by others. I am not making a ruling at this moment. I am merely asking the hon. member's co-operation with respect to the situation I have indicated. I shall follow the debate very closely from now to the end, and if there is no other cause for me to rise I shall be glad to remain seated and listen to the other speeches that are made.

Mr. Knowles: If Your Honour has occasion to cite standing order 40, paragraph 2, again, would you let us know whether there are any precedents for ruling that repetition refers to repetition of arguments that another member has made? There is nothing to that effect in standing order 40, subsection 2, itself.

Mr. Speaker: No. If the hon. member will look at the report of the committee on procedure in 1927, where to avoid redundancy they eliminated those words and just combined the one standing order pertaining to relevancy and the one standing order pertaining to repetition, he will find it shows the words. But in practice the Speakers have always enforced the rule as it was in the text before the article was simplified by the committee on procedure in 1927. See *Journals*, volume LXIV, 1926-7, pages 242-3. See also volume III, *Debates*, 1920, page 2286; and *Debates*, March 10, 1939, page 1782.

Mr. Green: May I suggest to Your Honour that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris is in order in commenting on the fact that the Prime Minister has not taken part in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Order.