

each other, and helps us to avoid the pitfalls of misunderstanding which have bedevilled relations of so many other countries in the world.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not by press notices.

Mr. Pearson: Let us do nothing in this parliament to bedevil our relations with our friends or to create pitfalls or misunderstandings. Let us do our best here to fill up pitfalls of misunderstanding. But, Mr. Speaker, defence is only one illustration of the validity of the motion of no confidence in the government that we are moving. There are others. I think I should mention one or two before I resume my seat. They also illustrate the delay, indecision and confusion of government policies in fields where there should be leadership and decision. I think of unemployment, which is still the most important human problem for the people of Canada. Job security—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An hon. Member: Again?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Again, yes, because there has been another breach of the rules. Do you understand?

An hon. Member: Read your rule book.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, after a very lengthy introduction to his remarks the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) has for some time now been dealing with a subject, namely defence policy. It is quite evident now that he is turning to an entirely different subject, namely unemployment, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that in doing so he is violating the rules of this house. He has sought to excuse what he is about to do this afternoon by indicating that at the conclusion of his remarks he is going to introduce an amendment of a quite extraordinary nature. It is the kind of amendment that is obviously designed to permit the Leader of the Opposition, if he succeeds, to reverse the rules of the house and to discuss a number of subjects. It was said by him earlier in his remarks, perhaps when you yourself were not in the chair, Mr. Speaker, that he was seeking to make a grievance of what he said was indecision on the part of the government. So he is proposing, as he says, in dealing with that subject to range over a number of subjects looking, as he says, for examples.

Mr. Speaker, in my submission, if this is the type of amendment he is going to introduce it is not a proper amendment on such a motion, and it cannot be made a cover under any circumstances for a plain violation of the rules of this house, which require that an hon. member—and this applies

Alleged Lack of Government Leadership

also to the hon. member who leads off first on the motion—must speak on a certain subject. That is the language of citation 241(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition; it says "a certain subject". It is plain to be seen that if it is possible to introduce motions of this kind, and then under cover of such motion to talk about any subject, then the Leader of the Opposition does not need to confine himself to two, or three, or four, or five; there is literally no limit to the number of subjects which he can discuss. He will be able to say: "Well, they are additional evidence of a general charge which I am undertaking to prove".

Mr. Speaker, this is a palpable attempt to destroy the rules and to ride rough shod over the rules. I would remind you of the language used by the former speaker in this house on April 24, 1961, at page 3935 of *Hansard*, where the speaker laid down this rule in dealing with just such a situation. He said:

Therefore, the proper course to follow in raising a grievance in going into supply is for the hon. member, when he starts, to state the grievance at least in terms sufficient to delimit the area of discussion.

This is not the only relevant citation; there is another one which will be found on March 31, 1961. There a similar point was raised; the Leader of the Opposition started out to talk about a number of subjects, and then, having claimed a privilege which is accorded no other member of the house, introduced an amendment which then confined debate.

Mr. Speaker, I close with this observation, that if it is competent to the Leader of the Opposition in leading off on such a motion to introduce a number of subjects, it will in my respectful submission be equally competent to any member of this house who follows him in debate to discuss any or all of those subjects. I am prepared to prophesy, Mr. Speaker, that if the Leader of the Opposition brings in his amendment we would afterwards be told that we must confine ourselves specifically to the amendment. But there will then be on the record statements by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to a variety of subjects.

Now, it seems to me in the light of decisions of the past in such situations and the clearly established practice of the house, that that is not the way a supply debate should be conducted. The whole basis of the supply debate is to deal with one subject at a time, and we exhaust that subject before we proceed to another. In my respectful submission, if the Leader of the Opposition has chosen to discuss defence, and he has been at it now, I think, for about three quarters of an hour, then that is the subject he has chosen. He should bring in his amendment and it is not