

be the same as one made in connection with a previous motion under Standing Order 60(3), it should be accepted because the government is allowed to make two similar motions in the same session. That may be so, but the matter is still entirely hypothetical at this time. If the hon. member had raised the question whether it is competent for the government to present a second budget during the same session the Chair would have had to make a ruling on that point. But that is not the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. This having been said, I believe there is no real disagreement between the hon. member for Edmonton West, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Chair. A caveat has been entered and it will be considered if and when the kind of amendment referred to is proposed in due course either in connection with this budget or in connection with a third budget which might come before the House during the same session.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Are things as bad as that?

Mr. Benson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say we have presented a new budget with new ideas but we expect the same old criticism from the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly a new point of order.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) dealing with points of procedure. He is so far off base he is just about the same as when he is dealing with financial matters of the country. In any event, we have raised the point at the first opportunity. Your Honour has interpreted rightly what we are doing.

I should like to make a brief reference to the remarks I made the other day as to how to judge this budget presentation, how to divide it. First of all, it seems to me we heard a great long presentation with regard to tax changes. I shall not call them tax reforms, I shall call them tax changes. I shall get into the reasoning a little later. I would say that the really important part as far as the country is concerned at the present time was the economic review and the proposals of the government, whether monetary or fiscal, to get the economy moving. Those were the important things. What we saw was a reversal of that emphasis; we saw all sorts of gimmicks, and some of them are very gimmicky. Some which appear to be very palatable things for the general taxpaying public were trotted out at great length in the tax change section which occupies by far the longest portion of the budgetary proposals. The minister was using, shall we say, a certain amount of political acumen in so doing, because I would say we were seeing some sort of a shell game and the Canadian public knows it. We know very well the reputation of the white paper. I recall the hurrahs with which hon. members opposite greeted the white paper. How beautiful it was, the white paper. But since then, of course, they have changed their minds. The other night all they did was applaud when

The Budget—Hon. Mr. Lambert

the minister indicated the various steps in the retreat from Moscow.

The minister remembers as well as I do the speech he delivered in Edmonton to the Chamber of Commerce. The white paper was almost deified, but the minister always added a little bit at the end. He said; Oh well, this is all very good indeed, but we are reasonable people and we shall listen. All right. Fine. But it is the same thing as the former Secretary of State, when she was Minister of National Health and Welfare, with version No.1 of the Canadian Pension Plan. It was the best of all possible plans and the critics were nuts. I am using polite language, though the hon. lady of the day did not always use polite language in describing her critics.

But this was essentially the position taken by hon. members opposite. Those who mounted campaigns against this plan were treated as candidates for institutions for the mentally unstable. This is a fact. I am sure if we wanted to put on a sound track all of the pronouncements of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) we would wonder whether he should now be in that institution for the mentally unstable as a result of shaking his brains so often in the flip-flops he has gone through on this thing. This is just a matter of record. We saw these changes. In some ways there is a great deal of relief today about the measures proposed by the Minister of Finance. One of my colleagues said that it is as if a man who expected to be told that he had lung cancer was told that he does have it, but only in one lung. Therefore the relief is great but in some ways the ultimate outcome is always fatal.

• (12:20 p.m.)

I am going to deal with the tax changes in the sequence adopted by the minister and not in what I think is the order of importance as far as the public is concerned. People are confused; many cannot differentiate between the changes in the 1971 budget and those which will come into effect from 1972 onwards. I am not going to criticize the proposals in detail but some of them do not come into effect until about 1976. There is quite a time spread; I am not going to criticize this but let us look at what will and what may affect people. I think this was done deliberately to confuse the issues and draw attention away from the deficiencies in the remainder of the budget. Consider the statement of the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) and that of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride), both of whom are not here—

An hon. Member: Where are they?

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Oh, sit down!

An hon. Member: Hoot, hoot!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West has castigated some of our members for not