

Mr. Nielsen: I hear a heckler on the other side say we deserve it. If he will withhold his enthusiasm until I cite some of these citations, he may change his tune. If he has ever read May, Madam Speaker, he might even understand the arguments I am about to propose to you. I have turned up May and Beauchesne. I am going to quote from them to perhaps jog the minister's memory, which perhaps is becoming a little senile with the years he has spent in this place.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: There can be no doubt that when a minister makes a statement outlining the financial situation of the country and accompanies that with a ways and means motion, which he did, for the purpose of raising or adding to additional taxes, this according to all of the authorities constitutes a budget. Traditionally this is preceded by a budget resolution which has the effect of providing for a budget debate, following a reference to committee, providing opportunity for the House to criticize the policy outlined by the minister. The minister has chosen this shallow and tawdry device to avoid that debate.

The House leader for the NDP makes the suggestion that this very serious matter can be resolved by some kind of cosy little chat between House leaders. I say to him on behalf of all members of the House, including his own backbenchers, that the seriousness of this matter goes beyond a cosy little chat among House leaders. It affects the privileges of every single member of this House who wants to participate in a debate and criticize.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: That is why the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) suggested an airing before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections where views can be expressed.

There is another serious matter. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says he does not expect the members of the opposition to criticize what they put forward last fall in their budget, and so why we should be raising a fuss may not be understood by a good many members in the House. Certainly those opposite do not care whether we understand or not. They intend to proceed like a steamroller in any event. They are up to their same old tricks because they are the same old bunch.

Some of the matters we would like to have debated which point out the seriousness of what this government is trying to do is the \$14.2 billion deficit which is projected for 1980-81 as compared with the \$10.5 billion projected by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) when he was finance minister. We would like to debate the \$11.5 billion deficit which the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) project for 1979-80 which differs from that contained in the budget of our government. We would like to debate his figure of a .5 per cent real growth in 1980 as compared with the 1 per cent predicted by ourselves.

Privilege—Mr. W. Baker

We would like to debate the 8 per cent unemployment figure that is projected by the minister as compared with that projected in our budget. We would like to debate the 10 per cent inflation he projected for 1980 as compared with the 11 per cent projected in our budget. We would like to debate the increases in interest and oil import costs which are being increased by \$2 billion more than forecast on December 11 in our budget for 1980-81, and over-all increase of 13½ per cent. We would like to debate the revenue loss because of a decision not to impose the 18-cent excise tax, which means revenues of \$2.5 billion less than forecast in our budget. We would like to debate the blended oil price which the government say would reduce the deficit and expenditures by \$1 billion as the oil import subsidy is progressively phased out.

We would like to debate his dropping of the common stock investment plan. We would like to debate the changes in the treatment of capital gains and RRSPs. We would like to debate the provision for the transfer of capital gains on farming assets to RRSPs. We would like to debate his statement that also abandons special incentives for the Atlantic region, investment incentives for Atlantic fishing vessels, tax contracts for firms investing in depressed regions. We would like to debate the fact that he provides no major relief for home owners facing renewal of mortgages. Only those actually facing foreclosure will be helped. Those are some of the matters that the conduct of this minister and his government are preventing us from debating.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre sees no difference between what the Minister of Finance is attempting to do now and the occasion which arose, not as he believes in 1957, but rather in 1962. I have gone to the trouble of having the *House of Commons Debates* produced for me for that period. It was when the hon. member for Eglinton, Mr. Fleming, who was then minister of finance, was engaged in something which bears a similarity, a long-range similarity, to what is happening here. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre participated in that debate at the time. It begins, for his easy reference, on page 783 of *Hansard* for October 22, 1962.

● (1430)

Mr. Knowles: There was also an incident in December, 1957.

Mr. Nielsen: This, I submit, is the relevant precedent and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre certainly had quite a number of things to say in opposition to the procedure which was allegedly being adopted at that time by the minister of finance of the day, Mr. Fleming. But the distinction there is very vivid. The House at that time under the rules then in force was in Committee of the Whole on ways and means. It was already a debate which had engaged seven or eight days of the time of the House with interventions by many members. The chairman at page 795 of the *Hansard* record of those debates at that time said:

Order. I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but this is the point at which we seem to be moving away from the ambit of section (2) of Standing Order 59.