

to be delivered, the Member, whether he be the Prime Minister, a cabinet minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the leaders of other parties, or any other Member on their behalf, may count, I am sure, on the good sense of the House. I am satisfied that if the circumstances warranted, the House would graciously welcome the reading of a carefully prepared statement. I cannot conceive, for instance, that the House would not have allowed the reading of a carefully prepared statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he opened the debate on that subject this day. I cannot conceive either that the House would have refused the honourable Member for Brantford recently the opportunity of reading notes when he spoke in such delightful French.

3. As we all know, by experience, there are several types of readers; for instance:

- (a) There are those who leave hardly any doubt to anyone that they are reading their speeches. They hold a text in their hands and follow it with eyes fixed on every word they speak.
- (b) There are those who read well, but who are just as guilty under the rule as those under the first category. They are accustomed to public speaking, enjoy a good eyesight and the faculty of picking up two lines of their text at every turn of the eye. Therefore, they provoke less suspicion, but they are just as guilty of reading their speeches.
- (c) There are those who come between the first and the second categories. They read large portions of their speeches, or they follow notes so copious that they hardly save appearances, that they are reading their speeches.
- (d) There are those who read their speeches but enjoy so much prestige and popularity among their colleagues that they might benefit from more indulgence. There are others who may be taken to task at every opportunity. In the case of the former, the honourable Member who raises the point of order will be regarded as mean, and in the case of the latter, he will be considered as smart.

The great source of our difficulties in determining an offence resides, I submit, in a too great reliance and stress placed upon these words found both in May and Bourinot:

"May refer to his notes". What kind of notes? That is the question. It seems that each Member has his own conception of the meaning of this word.

With the exclusion of these words from the rule, so that it could simply read in the terms of Redlich above quoted: "It is strictly forbidden to read a speech", could we not understand that a Member holding a sketch of his speech in his hands, the dividing headings for memory purposes, is not violating the rule.

4. A Member must express his own views in his own words, the best assurance to that effect being given when a Member speaks without any aid whatsoever. By aid I mean a written text or a scaffold built up with files of Hansards on one's desk to rest the text on, or several volumes from which to quote extracts after extracts, the Member contributing only the transitory sentences to link up with the extracts.

5. There is no doubt in my mind that if we are to preserve the dignity and respect for Parliament something must be done against that form of speech reading, which consists of carrying on debate by proxy. I am referring, of course, to the inclusion in speeches of innumerable quotations.

If a Member cannot quote even himself strict limitations are imposed on quotations from documents, books, newspapers or other printed publications. By quotations, both in the United Kingdom and in Canada, are meant extracts only, not copious nor lengthy nor carried to excess from literary authors or