

we do want to know is how that money will be spent, how it is earmarked and who will be spending it and when. The idea put forward here is that the money will be helpful but, at the same time, that it will presumably be reserved for the election campaign. Lastly, in this editorial, the view is expressed that all this is not without a suggestion; that is, that all this money pouring into the province at the time of an election suggests something, and this paper makes plain what that suggestion is. It states plainly that the suggestion is that the people of Saskatchewan can be bought. That was why I asked the question: "Are we trying to buy them with their own money?" Later, it uses the word "bribe." It admits that this is an ugly word but asks whether what is transpiring can be described otherwise. I hope these remarks will enable hon. gentlemen to see the bearing of the question I asked the other night.

In another editorial, published on Saturday, May 26, the first thought put forward is that the Canadian government seems to have the idea that production should be restricted, that acreage should be cut down; and since the restriction of production is the very thing which the grasshoppers are attending to, this editorial wonders why the government is resorting to such an expensive method, voting millions to put down grasshoppers, when they are restricting production, doing the very thing in which the government believes. The second thought in the editorial of Saturday, May 26, is this. Here we have the spectacle in London and Rome of highly paid officials planning to restrict production—

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I hesitate to interrupt, but this is far afield from the item under discussion. I think we have been over generous in listening not only to the remarks made but especially to the quoting of editorials, which I believe is out of order. I have no hesitation in answering any question that may be asked with regard to the subject under discussion, but I would call the attention of the chair to the fact that the quotation from editorials is entirely out of order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Can we have a second point of order before the first one is decided? We ought to have a ruling on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Dauphin.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): That has been disposed of.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to say a word on the point of order. There is a well established rule that editorials are not to be read—

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. McINTOSH: The editorial is not being read at all.

Mr. BENNETT: —for the reason that you cannot introduce another member into parliament. There are 245 members of parliament, and debate assumes that members make arguments for the purpose of trying to induce their colleagues to get their point of view. You cannot introduce another member into the house, and that is what is done when you introduce a newspaper's editorial for the purpose. I suggest that possibly, if the hon. gentleman's attention is directed to the fact, he will realize the desirability of ceasing to follow that course. The reason for it is so obvious that it is difficult to understand why the rule should be transgressed.

Mr. McINTOSH: Speaking to the point of order, may I say that I was not reading the editorial; and if it comes down to ruling me out of order because I am quoting from an editorial, I can throw the paper away and talk in the same way. It would make no difference to me.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): My point of order is that the whole subject matter is out of order.

Mr. McINTOSH: In your opinion. It was not out of order when you were the first to put forward your partisan point of view the other night.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In reply to statements made on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): I had better give my ruling.

Mr. McINTOSH: It is not necessary if I am not going to refer to the editorial; you might as well save your time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): I think the point of order is well taken according to paragraph 306 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms which reads thus:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

In my opinion the discussion is out of order.

Mr. McINTOSH: Your opinion does not, in my estimation, amount to a row of pins.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw!

Mr. McINTOSH: But I accept it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): I am quoting paragraph 306.