

*National Defence Act Amendment*

this point, has formed his speech in totality. I hope the hon. member will co-operate and make his own remarks on clause 2 of the bill.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Perhaps Your Honour would permit me to raise a point of order which may possibly have been overlooked. I believe there have been rulings from the Chair on a number of occasions that any hon. member may quote from any source at all as long as he is willing to make the source his own and say that the views he is putting forward are the views he has adopted as his own. If one looks at the references he will find many to support this view. It is perhaps more frank to do this honestly and openly and admit who wrote the article than to deliver a speech in this house, the authorship of which is not so apparent.

**Mr. Starr:** They are all over on the other side.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Chairman, I would refer Your Honour as well to citation 144 on page 124 of *Beauchesne* which reads:

It is a rule in both houses of parliament that a member must address the house orally and not read from a written, previously prepared speech, for the reason that, "if the practice of reading speeches should prevail, members might read speeches that were written by other people, and the time of the house be taken up in considering the arguments of persons who were not deserving of their attention.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far, the hon. member for Port Arthur, as has been pointed out, has said almost nothing, but has read from a report appearing in one of the morning newspapers which is readily available to every member of this house if he wishes to read it. I suggest the point is well taken. Just referring to the article without taking the responsibility for the remarks being quoted is improper on two counts. First, hon. members should not refer extensively to newspaper reports and, second, they are not supposed to read their speeches. I am interested in the hon. member's thoughts, not in the ideas of some newspaper reporter.

• (9:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Brewin:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I refer to the contribution by the Minister of Transport. He said, as I understand it, that it is all right to read from the newspaper article if the hon. member adopts that article. How can he adopt the article when it contains a variety of views expressed by other people, some of which are clearly inconsistent with each other.

I have listened carefully to what the hon. member has read. In my view it is an excellent article but I would prefer to read it myself rather than hearing the hon. member read it in the house. In any event, it is impossible for the hon. member to make those views his own. As I have said, a great many of the views are ones that I would adopt, but they are inconsistent with other views in the article. How the hon. member can adopt this article as his own I fail to understand.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Perhaps I ought to say something, as the hon. member has challenged me directly. I read the article this morning, and I thought it was an excellent and judicious article containing many apt quotations. One could take those quotations, as Mr. Westell did, from the proceedings of the committee. If they were taken from the committee proceedings no one in the house would argue that it was improper to quote them. The mere fact that they were reprinted in the *Globe and Mail* does not make them any less quotations expressed during the committee proceedings. The hon. member does not need to accept those views, but interlarded with the quotations are the very sensible judgments of Mr. Westell, with which in the main I found it hard to disagree since they contain so much common sense, and which seem to lead obviously, and almost inevitably to a conclusion which may be distasteful to some hon. members. I did not find them distasteful, and obviously the hon. member for Port Arthur does not find them distasteful.

If he feels that Mr. Westell was able to put in convenient language the sentiments that he feels, it surely should not be wrong for him to be permitted to express them. At least he is honest enough to say who had produced them.

I can well remember a distinguished member of this house, the late Mackenzie King, quoting at great length from a speech of Winston Churchill without attribution until it was all over. Then he made a complete and frank confession. Mr. King was always frank.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** He revealed his source and nobody took exception to that.

I remember an occasion, when I was on the other side of the house, when I took up a sheet of paper to read column after column because, as I said, I wanted to be quite sure that my views on that occasion were put accurately. During the course of that reading Mr. Donald Fleming, who was sitting here,