

the vote of the House of Commons made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in the words put before the House in the motion, nothing is. I suggest that if this motion is put before the House it will certainly constitute a very direct reflection upon a vote already made by the House of Commons.

• (1510)

I will come to the final point of my argument. If the preceding two points have not been convincing to my hon. friends, perhaps the paragraph that I shall read from *Beauchesne's Fourth Edition*, citation 200(1), will have the desired effect. The citation reads as follows:

An old rule of Parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House." Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the House might be used in the discussion of motions of the same nature and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same session.

The old rule of parliament is a very sound rule. In this session, just a week ago, the House of Commons approved the budgetary policies of the government. This motion asks the House this week to condemn as inequitable and inadequate the budgetary policies of the government. I suggest that one of the functions of the rules of parliament is to prevent the House from reaching contradictory conclusions, and one of the purposes of the rules of the House of Commons is to prevent members of the House from making fools of themselves to the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Presumably the hon. member who is proposing to move the motion is hoping desperately that the motion will carry. What would the situation be if it did carry, at least from a logical point of view aside from other consequences that my hon. friends may wish? The logical situation may be that last week the House of Commons approved the budget and this week it disapproves it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, before I commence, I wonder if the minister will file the power of attorney he exercised in this connection from his hon. friends to the left.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I looked at my friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I was hoping he might intervene because I have here a list of the various statements made by his leader, passionate purpose prose in which the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) disclosed his views about the issue of this subject matter. I expected the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to spring to the defence of his leader in an effort to have this matter ventilated and made the subject of discussion, but I see this is not to be the case.

Never have I heard such an effort made by a government to circumscribe opportunities for fair debate in this House—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Effect of Budgetary Proposals

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin:—which have been slowly diminishing over the years. Since the 1968 election, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his friends have surely and inexorably attempted, and in many cases have succeeded, to take from this House opportunities to debate matters of consequence. My party and the people of this country take a serious view of this attempt to interfere with the traditional and historical rights of this House to challenge governments on the issue of supply.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: In any discussion of this matter, Mr. Speaker, that is a principle which dare not be forgotten. I ask Your Honour to examine the terms of the motion which stands in the name of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) as follows:

That this House expresses its lack of confidence that the combination of the corporate tax reductions and accelerated depreciation write-offs contained in the Budget of May, 1972 and proposals contained in the Budget of February, 1973 constitutes an adequate and equitable response to the needs of the country.

What is it that this House decided when the vote was taken last Wednesday with regard to the question raised by the government House leader? "That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government." What budgetary policy? I will not take the time, and I suppose I would be out of order if I did, to outline what I thought of the budgetary policy. That has been done most effectively. However, the budgetary policy is contained in the budgetary proposals introduced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) on February 19, and which are the subject of Ways and Means resolutions. There is no question at all that an examination of the minister's speech on that day refers to a number of items. The minister started off by addressing some preliminary remarks on this issue and then we find the heading "May, 1972, Budget Measures". Referring to the budget of February 19, 1973, the Minister of Finance said and I quote:

This budget reinforces and builds upon the budget which I put before the House last May.

Obviously, the Minister of Finance, this House and the people of this country made the clearest possible distinction between the budgetary proposals contained in the budget which the Minister of Finance placed before the House in 1972 and the measures which the Minister of Finance placed before the House on February 19, 1973. Here is the Budget Speech which was circulated in the country and to all members of the House. It differentiates in every way between the budgetary proposals of May, 1972 and February, 1973. At page nine, the minister recapitulates what was attempted in the budget of 1972 which was not passed. He is peering into the future, dealing with unemployment and inflation. Then he says: "I now turn to the budget measures themselves." What measures? The measures he is intending to bring forward, measures expressed in the ways and means resolutions which attach to the budget and which are restricted exclusively to the budget proposals of February, 1973.