

*Alleged Lack of Government Leadership*

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** So there will be no doubt about it, I want it to be on *Hansard* that this kind of scattergun nonsense cannot go on. The hon. gentleman must specifically restrict himself to the subject on which he intends to move non-confidence.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the point of order which has been raised by the Prime Minister. In so doing I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention the citation which you used in support of the tentative ruling you were about to make. The citation you referred to has to do with a discussion in committee of supply on an item of the estimates. It seems to me the matter is very well established. As a matter of fact there is a citation in *Beauchesne* that establishes such a wide limit of debate on this kind of motion that it is possible for an hon. member to make a speech for 30 minutes or 35 minutes on one subject and to move a motion on an entirely different subject. That is established within the limits of *Beauchesne* and there is a citation to that effect.

**Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert):** What citation is that?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert):** What citation is that?

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I want to make this point to Your Honour. It was obvious to any hon. member who was listening to the Leader of the Opposition and was not nervously apprehensive about the next day or so that he was making a charge against the government of indecision and lack of leadership. That was his main charge and that is likely to be the charge mentioned in the motion. Surely it is open to the Leader of the Opposition in supporting that charge to refer to any subject matter within the confines of the federal government which will establish lack of decision and lack of leadership.

**Mr. Churchill:** If I may speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the reference which I think should be drawn to the attention of the house in *Beauchesne's* fourth edition is on page 199, citation 234(2). It reads as follows:

(2) It often happens, on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for committee of supply, that members air grievances without moving amendments. A member may speak on railway rates, another on naturalization, and so on. Five or six different matters may then be brought to the government's attention. Once debate is concluded on one matter and another matter intervenes, members cannot again discuss the former. No member is allowed to speak more than once on the motion. He cannot discuss all the matters which may then come up, and when he has spoken

on one of them he has exhausted his right to speak to the motion before the house, namely, "That the Speaker do now leave the chair".

The point of that citation is that the person speaking on this motion must be specific; either he deals with a subject without moving an amendment or he moves an amendment which discloses his subject and then speaks to the subject. However, he cannot range over the whole field of the business of the country.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Perhaps I should continue with the citation to which I referred earlier. Then I shall be glad to hear the hon. member for Ottawa West. This is a ruling of Mr. Speaker Beaudoin. I will quote a little more fully from page 3790 of the debates of 1955, volume IV:

What I am concerned about is that we should not deviate from what has been the practice with respect to the raising of grievances. It must be a specific grievance. According to the remarks the hon. member for Prince Albert has just made in explanation of what he intends to bring forward, he wants to deal with markets generally and the loss of markets for farm products and then, although he has already dealt with wheat, he wants to deal with the South Saskatchewan dam. He has just indicated he wants to deal with that point because that is the point to which the editorial in the *Regina Leader-Post* has reference. Furthermore, he wants to deal with the low incomes with which the farmers are now being faced. Maybe the hon. member is going to conclude his remarks with an amendment to the motion to go into supply. That would certainly specify the grievance he has in mind.

If he is not going to terminate his remarks with such an amendment, then I am afraid I must say he can always deal with these various other subjects when other motions to go into supply are presented. At this moment, however, it would not be proper to initiate another budget debate, and it is certainly contrary to our practice not to have a specific grievance raised at this point.

The reason I use the citation is that it refers to a ruling with respect to the then hon. member for Prince Albert, now the Prime Minister. I think that ruling is amply supported by the reference made by the house leader. If there are any other contributions hon. members wish to make, I shall be glad to hear them.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Speaking on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say this. The citation which has just been referred to by the house leader is one which applies to grievances and which normally follows the vote on the amendment to the motion to go into supply. If one looks at the citation, which is 234 (2), one can come to no other conclusion but that.

The Prime Minister raised a point of order and in doing so referred to the "nonsense" which has been brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition. With respect, I submit to you that the Leader of the Opposition was not dealing with nonsense but rather with the confusion, indecision and lack of