

In the 4th edition of Bourinot, we find the following comment, at page 335:

"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 written 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'. It is the invariable practice to discountenance all such written speeches, and it is the duty of the Speaker to interfere when his attention is directed to the fact. Members may, however, make use of notes in delivering a speech".

Beauchesne, in Citation 238 of his 3rd edition, which is his Citation 314 of his 2nd edition, echoes Bourinot's comments on the subject, and in Citation 239, he reports a statement by Mr. Speaker Glen, delivered on February 20, 1942, to which I propose to refer later. In Citation 246 (o) of his 3rd edition, which is Citation 293 (o) of his 2nd edition, Dr. Beauchesne says:

"Besides the prohibitions contained in Standing Order 41"—now our Standing Order 35—"it has been sanctioned by usage, both in England and in Canada, that a member while speaking must not: (o) Read from a written, previously prepared speech".

An analysis of these authoritative comments lead us to the following conclusions:

1. Contrary to general belief, perhaps, there is no rule prohibiting absolutely the reading of speeches. The use of notes is recognized both in England and in Canada.

May says: "A member is not permitted to read his speech, but may refresh his memory by reference to notes".

Bourinot says: "Members may, however, make use of notes in delivering a speech".

See *Debates*, Vol. 1, 1935, pages 337-338; *Debates*, Vol. 1, 1935, page 835; *Debates*, Vol. 2, 1937, pages 1577-78; *Debates*, Vol. 4, 1946, page 3447.

2. The rule is relaxed in the case of important statements. In this respect, as we will see later, Canadian Speakers, in their statements, have shown, before the last war, much severity in exempting Members from the rule, reasonable latitude during the war, and much leniency since the last war.

3. The policing of this rule has been left to the initiative and good sense of honourable Members. Although Speakers have not felt precluded from intervening, occasionally, on their own, the rule, both in England and in Canada, puts on honourable Members the onus of notifying the Speaker of any infractions.

May says: "The Chair does not, as a rule, intervene, unless appealed to".

Bourinot corroborates May's opinion. "It is the duty of the Speaker to interfere when his attention is directed to the fact".

See *Debates*, Vol. 1, 1940, pages 296-297; *Debates*, Vol. 3, 1941, page 2464; *Debates*, Vol. 1, 1942, page 822.

I have examined several Canadian Speakers' rulings and statements over a period extending from 1885 to date.

The list of rulings considered, with their references, is as follows: *Debates*, Vol. 2, May 8, 1885, page 1713; *Debates*, Vol. 2, May 1, 1888, page 1101; *Debates*, Vol. 2, April 1, 1890, page 2763; *Debates*, Vol. 1, March 13, 1902, page 1169; *Debates*, Vol. 4, May 11, 1907-8, page 8249; *Debates*, Vol. 5, May 18, 1907-8, pages 8660-61; *Debates*, Vol. 5, May 26, 1907-8, page 9175; *Debates*, Vol. 3, March 14, 1912-13, page 5724; *Debates*, Vol. 3, March 14, 1912-13, page 5728; *Debates*, Vol. 3, May 31, 1920, page 2966; *Debates*, Vol. 3, April 30, 1925, page