

*Combines Investigation Act*

23, 1949. I think that is being very lenient. If I were in court for speeding at fifty miles an hour and I said to the magistrate, "But, Your Honour, my speedometer said thirty," I do not think it would do the trick. I believe the Minister of Justice should be bound by the date on the report, which he himself said on November 4 was the date he received it. But I am prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt. I am prepared to admit that he was busy up in Manitoba—

**Mr. Lesage:** On a point of order, I would ask the hon. member if he is speaking to his amendment before he moves it.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That was why I was ruled out.

**Mr. Lesage:** I think the hon. member is speaking to his amendment before it is moved. If he is speaking to the motion for second reading, I respectfully submit that he is out of order. He must move his amendment before speaking to it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I rather agree with the hon. member. If the amendment the hon. member proposes to submit to the house is not in order, then of course it is not in order for him to speak to it.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** That is why he is speaking in this way.

**Mr. Speaker:** If there is some question whether or not the amendment is in order, that must be decided now, and the hon. member must not speak to his amendment. I think that is only fair; and in view of the ruling which prevented the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) from speaking, I do not think I should permit the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to speak to an amendment which may be out of order. It is true that was more or less of a technicality, when the hon. member for Lake Centre sat down and handed in his amendment, but I could not permit him to proceed then in any event. Nor can I at this time permit the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to discuss an amendment which may be out of order.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I moved an amendment. A question of order was raised; Your Honour stood, and I have always been deferential, so I sat down. Because I did so, I was ruled out. I make that statement in reply to Your Honour now. I never fail to sit down when the Speaker stands. Your Honour stood; I sat down, and then I was ruled out.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think that is a correct statement. The only thing the hon. member has not mentioned is the fact that he sent his amendment to me, and when it was handed

[Mr. Knowles.]

to me I rose and read it to the house. Then, of course, the amendment was before the house. I am sorry the incident occurred, but without the unanimous consent of the house there was nothing I could have done which would have permitted the hon. member to speak again.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Speaking to the point of order that has been raised, surely no amendment or motion is before the house until it has been read by the Speaker. If it is not before the house, the hon. member cannot be ruled out of order for speaking to it. He has read the amendment he intends to move, but it is not yet before the house; and it must be taken in relation to the subject matter of the speech he is making.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** We all listened attentively to the amendment being read, but we have not received an official copy of it. The hon. member read his amendment at length—

**Mr. Coldwell:** The amendment he thinks of moving; but he may yet change it.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** I would expect the action to follow the thought in this connection. One does not read a proposed amendment without intending to move it. It seems to me this amendment is out of order, but the hon. member is such an expert in procedure that he is trying to discuss the amendment—

**Mr. Casselman:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid there cannot be a point of order here.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** If the amendment is out of order, I cannot conceive that the hon. member should be given another fifteen minutes in which to discuss it. We know what the amendment is, and it contains statements which are not according to the facts and which were rebutted and refuted yesterday in the speech of the Minister of Justice. That is the basis of the proposed amendment; and when it is read by the Chair we shall discuss the question of its legality.

**Mr. Coldwell:** If the minister is going to refer to the speech of the Minister of Justice yesterday, I take it we shall all have the same privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** The minister was speaking to a point of order; but as one hon. member has said already, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre must deal at this time with matters relevant to the main motion.

**Mr. Garson:** May I clear up just one point, on a question of privilege? It will be necessary to refer to my remarks yesterday in order to do so. In the course of his remarks