

(standing order 41); cast reflections upon the conduct of judges (May 295; Bourinot 358); refer to matters pending a judicial decision (May 316); reflect upon the conduct of persons in authority (May 316); make personal allusions to members (May 316); refer to other debates during the same session, or to any question not under discussion (May 317-318; Bourinot 336).

Bourinot, page 335, refers to these objections when he says a member may read extracts from documents, books, or other printed publications as part of his speech provided in so doing he does not infringe upon any point of order.

When the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) quoted letters in an argument against the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and when the minister retorted with telegrams, I did not interfere because great latitude has always been given with respect to citations in this house. We follow the same practice as in England where the house itself seems to have settled the procedure in these cases. I take it that the same rule applies to telegrams and letters as to extracts from newspapers.

The practice of reading extracts or written statements in debate to support an argument has been followed in the British house since 1840 when Speaker Peel, with the acquiescence of the house, allowed a member to proceed to read passages from a newspaper. In 1856, when a member was called to order for reading an extract from a newspaper, the Speaker stated that on former occasions when he had attempted to enforce this rule, he had been overruled by the house. A similar statement was made by the chairman in committee on the 9th March, 1857 (May 318). These are the last precedents cited in the 13th edition of May, published in 1924.

The house may be indulgent in these matters but it is a well known principle that a statement made in this house cannot be contradicted by a statement made by a person who is not a member of the house.

STANDING COMMITTEES

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, MISCELLANEOUS
PRIVATE BILLS—CHANGES IN PERSONNEL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING
(Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of Mr. Little be substituted for that of Mr. Slaght on the standing committee on privileges and elections, and that the name of Mr. Slaght be substituted for that of Mr. Little on the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

Motion agreed to.

POWELL AND UNWIN CASE

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT TO DISCUSS MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the house, under standing order 31, for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the advisability of the Minister of Justice granting the request made of his majesty's attorney general and premier of the province of Alberta for the remission of the sentence recently placed upon Messrs. Powell and Unwin in Edmonton, who are reported to be now incarcerated for an offence alleged to have been committed in the said province, which is administered by the above premier and attorney general.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was kind enough to give me notice of his motion. I find that leave for introducing such a motion is covered by standing order 31, paragraph 3 of the said standing order being as follows:

(3) He—

The member—

—then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order, and of urgent public importance, reads it out,—

And so on. I have read the document handed me by the hon. member, but I do not regard it as coming within the purview of this paragraph. I consider that it is not a matter of urgent public importance, and in consequence I rule that he cannot introduce the motion.

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, arising out of your ruling. May I point out that paragraph 4 states:

If less than twenty, but not less than five, members rise in their places, the question whether the member has leave to move the adjournment of the house shall be put forthwith, without debate, and determine, if necessary, by a division.

Then, I find this further statement in paragraph 3:

If objection is taken, Mr. Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places and, if more than twenty members rise accordingly, Mr. Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

In other words I do not think the Speaker of the House may determine whether or not such a motion is in order. As I interpret the rule, if twenty or more members of the house are anxious that the hon. member introducing the motion be permitted to proceed with the