

who has the floor, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation).

He cannot do it in any event without interrupting a member who has the floor. It might be a question of fact or something that is a matter of importance to him and he might desire to establish the correctness of what he has said or otherwise. It seems to me that you cannot obey the rule and do your duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is always done by consent of the House. Of late years and perhaps this year more than ever the tendency to interrupt has become very marked and is not facilitating debate but obstructing debate.

Mr. FIELDING. A member will have his right to explain at the close of the speech. If I am addressing the House and I say something that my hon. friend thinks is not fair to him, he ought not to interrupt me at the time, but he will have his right when I sit down.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not meet the point. When an incorrect statement is made it is present to the mind of everybody and it would be more appropriate to make the explanation or correction just then. A speech may extend over an hour, and if a member is not permitted to make a correction when the statement objected to is made, in nine cases out of ten the reader of the speech will afterwards overlook the correction. The correction or denial should be printed together with the statement which has been taken exception to.

Mr. FOSTER. That rule ought to be well considered. Our speeches are printed and distributed throughout the country, and if there is no chance to make a correction at the time a misstatement is made that misstatement goes to the country without the correction. Very often a gentleman speaking may unintentionally say something which is not correct, and if it were pointed out to him at the time he would withdraw it and the withdrawal and denial would go together with the speech. No matter how careful we may be any of us may be a little out in our facts at times; no person wishes to misrepresent an opponent in cold blood, and if I should say something believing it to be true, which the Minister of Finance knows may be a misrepresentation of fact, it is much better that the Minister of Finance should have the permission to interrupt and have the correction made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that no one would intentionally misrepresent in cold blood, but the courtesy is always extended to the member who is not speaking to make such correction as he may wish. It is well to lay down the rule, however, that a member who has the floor should not be interrupted without his consent. Even if

the correction can only be made when the member addressing the House has resumed his seat I think it will be just as effective.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is that the two speeches do not go to the same people.

Mr. FIELDING. The idea is to prevent a member who has the floor being interrupted except by his consent.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the idea.

Mr. FIELDING. Any member can get the privilege of making an explanation now but if there is any doubt about it, could add the words 'except with the consent of the member,' making it clear that the speaker who has the floor shall not be interrupted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there is any real necessity for asserting that the member who has the floor has the right to the floor. That goes without saying. The new words in this rule were introduced from an Australian rule in which the context may be a little different. I think the words, 'or interrupt a member who has the floor' should be stricken out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I quite agree with you. The rule with this amendment would read:

No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

Rule as amended agreed to.

On rule 29, subsection (d),

(d) In all cases the reply of the mover of the original motion closes the debate, and it is the duty of Mr. Speaker to see that every member wishing to speak has the opportunity to do so before the final reply.

Mr. FOSTER. Instead of that reading 'and it is the duty of Mr. Speaker,' it should read, 'but it is the duty of Mr. Speaker.'

Mr. SPROULE. The phraseology would be better if the word 'but' were substituted for the word 'and,' and I move accordingly.

Rule as amended agreed to.

On rule 22.

CONDUCT OF MEMBERS.

22. No member is entitled to vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested will be disallowed.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know what is meant by the word 'direct'. It strikes me that a member of this House might have a very strong pecuniary interest which might escape the definition of the word 'direct'. I can understand that some qualifications of the word 'pecuniary' are ne-