

all of his time and move no amendment he is at liberty to refrain from making any such amendment.

Mr. Churchill: But not to speak on six or seven different subjects.

Mr. Knowles: He certainly may. There is nothing in the rules that says he cannot be scattergunned any more than there is anything in the rules that says that in this house people cannot be scatterbrained. Citation 234, to which partial references have already been made, says in subparagraph 1:

Whenever an order of the day has been read for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply—

And so on.

—it shall be permissible to discuss any public matter within the powers of the federal parliament or to ask for the redress of any grievance.

I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly in order in dealing with any grievance he likes if he wishes to do so. When Mr. Speaker Beaudoin was giving his lecture to the then member for Prince Albert, to which Your Honour has referred, he was not telling him he could not introduce all of these various subjects in his speech, but he was telling him that if he did he would not be able to come back to them afterwards.

Paragraph 2, to which I believe the Minister of Veterans Affairs has referred, says that once a subject has been brought up the member must stay on that subject and must not try to go back to it after another subject has been introduced. This paragraph describes the situation either now or after 8.15 tomorrow night when the subject has been identified. Once the Leader of the Opposition has finished and has pinpointed a subject or has moved an amendment, we have then got to stick with that, just the same as will be the case tomorrow night after the vote at 8.15. If a member gets the floor then and opens up a subject, that must be the subject until it is disposed of.

But at this point I submit that the Leader of the Opposition is exercising his right as the first speaker in this debate to raise any grievance he wishes to raise, to make his own decision whether or not he moves an amendment and to make his own decision as to what that amendment is. As far as I can ascertain from his speech thus far, it strikes me that he plans to make a motion suggesting that the government is indecisive, incapable, and that sort of thing. If so, surely it is plain, ordinary logic that he has the right to illustrate either in advance or after he has made the motion, the point he is trying to make.

Alleged Lack of Government Leadership

I submit that there has been a fair amount of confusion about this rule in the comments that have been made and that there has been too much of an attempt to dictate to a member of this house, who happens to be the Leader of the Opposition, what he shall put in his speech.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I now refer to the citation I mentioned—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka.

Mr. Aiken: I wish to refer to page 3134 of *Hansard* for March 20, 1961. In that instance we had reached approximately the same position that we now have in that there were broad, introductory remarks by the Leader of the Opposition and objection was taken. At that time the then Speaker said:

I cannot very well instruct the Leader of the Opposition how to make his speech but I can and I think I should say this. The hon. member's speech thus far has been, I think, too broadly discursive having regard to the previous discussions. If he is laying a foundation for a specific subject I feel he ought to come to it.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in my earlier remarks I attempted to support my statement that such great latitude was permitted on an amendment of this kind that it was possible for an hon. member to make a speech on transportation, let us say, and then move an amendment on national defence.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. MacEachen: In support of this statement I wish to refer Your Honour to page 202 of *Beauchesne*, citation 241, paragraph 2.

On the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for committee of supply—

That is the motion we are dealing with today.

—a member, before any amendment has been moved, may speak on a certain subject and spend the last minutes or seconds of his time limit in moving an amendment dealing with another subject, but then he cannot take part in the debate on his own amendment.

What I am saying is simply this, that this citation supports the view that when the amendment is moved it then becomes the subject matter before the house and the rule of relevancy is established at that point, but up until the amendment is moved the debate is wide ranging, so wide, indeed, and the limits so broad that one may make a speech on one subject and move an amendment on another.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to repeat all of the citations that have been referred to, but certainly in my opinion