

*Alleged Lack of Government Leadership*

then open to him to turn to another subject and open up an entirely new book of debate in the house.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Speaker, this is the third time the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fleming) rises on a point of order which is similar to this, and unfortunately for the Minister of Justice he has not stated to the house the facts. I would challenge the Minister of Justice to state that the Leader of the Opposition has dealt with a number of subjects. He has not dealt with a number of subjects; he has dealt with one subject and one subject alone, and that is the indecision and the hesitation of this government. Basing the argument on that assumption, which I submit is the only assumption that is before Your Honour at this time, then no matter how you view either citation 241 or citation 234 it is quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition is in order. Because citation 241(2) refers to the amendment which may be moved or has been moved, and says in effect that the speaker may refer to a certain subject. Citation 234(1) says:

When such motion is proposed, 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—

So with respect I say to you that the Leader of the Opposition all along, from the beginning of his introduction of the amendment with which he proposed to deal, indicated quite clearly that he was going to deal with the indecision of the government; and the Minister of Justice has no right in the remarks which he has made to anticipate what the Leader of the Opposition is going to say later on in his speech or in the remarks that he will make before he moves his amendment. Therefore I submit to you with deference, although you, sir, were not in the chair at the time, that thus far the only subject which the Leader of the Opposition has dealt with is the hesitation, the contradiction and the lack of leadership of the government.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, we are discussing a point of order which I think is similar to one raised a few minutes ago by the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker). Unfortunately you were not in the chair to hear the arguments on that particular point of order. I hope that I can help you in reaching a decision. Citation 234 of Beauséne says:

The ancient doctrine that the redress of grievances should be considered before the grant of supplies is maintained in the House of Commons of Canada—

This is the only premise for this supply motion. There are other citations. Paragraph [Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

(2) of citation 234 does in a broad general way indicate that many different subjects can be brought up. Citation 241(2) says:

On the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for committee of supply, a member, before any amendment has been moved, may speak on a certain subject and spend the last minutes or seconds of his time in moving an amendment dealing with another subject—

and then it goes on to say that debate would be confined to that subject after the amendment has been moved. Mr. Speaker, up to this time the amendment has not been moved, but by and large I think we can take it from what the Leader of the Opposition has said that he is going to move a motion based on confusion, delay and postponement. Up to this time I think it is fair to say that he has only been giving evidence to support his contention that there is confusion, delay, and so forth.

From my limited experience of these supply motions, I believe it has not been the practice to limit the debate to one specific subject and to have that specific subject named at the outset of the speech prior to the moving of the amendment. If there is a subamendment moved then after that subamendment has been moved it is the obligation of the members who wish to speak on it to stick to the subject matter of both amendments; but not prior to their having been moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. In this question I have examined the various citations which have been given by hon. members. Some have some strength, others have somewhat less strength. But I would say this, that the choice of the subject for an amendment is that of the mover. However, there must be some reason, and there must be some order to debate in this house. If an hon. member, before proposing his amendment, ranges over the whole spectrum and then at the last moment brings in his amendment he thereby, if we are to follow the reasoning suggested, prevents anyone else from discussing all those matters which he may have raised. In deciding as to the rights and obligations of various members this procedure seems to me to be somewhat unfair. In addition to that consideration, it strikes me that the suggested reasoning is contrary to the general practices of this house because he is to be followed by some other hon. member from some other group who may wish to put forward a subamendment and he does not even get a chance to see the amendment until he is almost on his feet. This procedure puts the member following at a serious disadvantage. One must consider the fairness of debate.

Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition has not yet worded his amendment. However, if he has indicated that the burden of his