

I feel that the Leader of the Opposition, particularly in the light of the fact he declared early in his remarks he intended to move an amendment, is almost binding himself to a fairly narrow subject. This is the basis of my ruling, and I so rule.

**Mr. Pearson:** This is I think, notwithstanding what my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has said, the eleventh or twelfth amendment I have moved to motions to go into supply. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that a ruling such as you have made has been applied.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** No.

**Mr. Pearson:** I know the kind of statements I made; I know what I said and I said what I intended to say. The Speaker permitted me to do so. This is also the first time when the government has held me up for 35 minutes in this procedure, which is no doubt the purpose of the operation.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has offended the rules of the house by imputing motives. He is suggesting, in effect, that a point of order has been taken for some other reason than the legitimate reason of asking for a ruling of the Chair. He is suggesting that many of those who have spoken from this side of the house have done so because they wished to delay him. I say that under the rules of the house, he has no right to impute motives of that kind.

In the light of what he has just now said, Mr. Speaker, may I refer you to *Hansard* for April 24, 1961, page 3935, where Mr. Speaker Michener, when just such a point was raised, concluded some very pertinent remarks with this observation:

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.

**Mr. Pearson:** Well, Mr. Speaker, whatever may have been the purpose, I did not mention my hon. friend by name. I do not know why he should have felt so guilty that he had to jump to his feet. I did not mention anybody by name. I said, "The purpose of the operation". Surely, it is possible to impute motives to a government if it is not to an individual member of this house. The Minister of Justice might have saved himself that five minute intervention. But whatever the purpose, there is no doubt about the effect.

If I were moving a motion on a specific subject, such as setting up a specific committee, and if that were made clear at the beginning of my statement, then of course I would be expected to speak to that and to

### *Alleged Lack of Government Leadership*

produce evidence that bore on the point. There is no doubt about that. The Minister of Justice and others seemed to have confused the moving of an amendment on the motion to go into supply with a grievance which can be raised after that amendment is voted upon. Then the speaker has to base his remarks on a particular point, and that is the only point that can be debated while grievances are being debated. However, I am moving an amendment to the motion, a motion of no confidence in the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this motion will be based on the lack of leadership, confusion and indecision of the government in dealing with our problems. Am I to be told by the government that I can only produce one piece of evidence to support that? I propose to stick very strictly to the motion that this government should be condemned because it is indecisive, because it has not shown leadership, because it is confused and undecided. This is my motion, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I propose to produce the kind of evidence which will support that kind of motion.

One can do this in two ways, if one likes. The Prime Minister talked about scattergun tactics. I cannot understand why he is worried about a scattergun. It can be done by a bullet, one bullet that goes to the target, I hope. It can be done by a shell which has a lot of pellets, and my shell has more than one pellet. They are all aimed at the target, and it is a big target and easy to hit.

One bit of evidence, Mr. Speaker, to support this general motion of no confidence in the leadership and direction of the government, is the way the government has been handling national defence policy. I bring that forward to support the motion which will be made at the end of my statement, a motion which will condemn the government because it has not shown leadership; it is confused and undecided, not only in respect of national defence but in respect of a lot of other matters. I begin with national defence because it is very much in our minds and because it provides the most graphic and dramatic evidence of confusion, bumbling and indecision we have had in a long time.

There is one way in the field of national defence in which this leadership might have been shown, in which some of this confusion may have been removed, when a decision might have been taken on the basis of the consensus of the House of Commons; that is by setting up a committee of this house on national defence policy. That is one way which a government that was concerned with giving leadership, which was concerned with getting the House of Commons behind it on