

*Effect of Budgetary Proposals*

believe the minister has been misinformed or has never received information to the effect that most standard forms of lease used by owners of such limited dividend projects contain a clause which provides in part as follows:

The tenant agrees that should Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation approve a rental increase for the rented premises then, and in that event, the rental hereinbefore set forth shall be increased to the amount approved by the said Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. That is hardly a point of order. It is, rather, a point of debate between the minister and the hon. member. Perhaps the matter might be pursued tomorrow during the question period. Orders of the day.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

On the order:

Consideration of the Business of Supply—*The President of the Privy Council.*

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if it would be proper for me to raise a point of order at this time on the proposed motion. I should like to do so at the earliest appropriate moment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps the Chair, without putting the motion formally, might at least read it so that it is on the record and so that hon. members who may have arguments to submit in respect of the motion might be given an opportunity to do so.

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—  
ALLEGED INADEQUACY OF 1972 BUDGET PROVISIONS  
FOR CORPORATIONS AND 1973 PROPOSALS TO MEET  
COUNTRY'S NEEDS

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion is as follows. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) would move:

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.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I regret the necessity of raising a point of order on this proposed motion. However, it seems to be so seriously deficient that one would be lacking in respect for the usages of parliament and the House of Commons if the opportunity were lost of pointing out the deficiencies in this particular motion, as proposed.

May I begin by referring Your Honour and hon. members of the House to *Votes and Proceedings* for Wednesday, February 22, 1973. On page 155 of *Votes and Proceedings* the following is recorded:

[Mr. Harney.]

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,— That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

The record goes on to state that at 5.45 o'clock p.m. Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 60(8), and the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division, 143 members supporting the motion approving the budgetary policy of the government and 102 members opposing the budgetary policy of the government. That is the basis upon which I have founded my point of order, as today the notice of motion that has been put before the House deals with that very question which has already been dealt with and decided upon in this House. The notice of motion reads:

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.

The House has already declared itself upon the budgetary policy of the government, as contained in the budget of February, 1973. The House of Commons debated the matter for six days. When the budget was before the House there was an opportunity, as provided under the rules, for members to move an amendment and sub-amendment and, on the final day, for a vote to be taken disposing of the budgetary policy of the government, or disposing of the motion which read:

That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

The motion presently proposed tries to revive the same subject. It tries to revive the matter of the budgetary policy of the government, a matter that has already been adopted, and it now asks the House to regard as inequitable and inadequate the budgetary policy which the House just last week approved in general.

My first submission is this: Standing Order 60 provides a method by which the House can come to grips with the budgetary policy which has been presented. The House can come to grips with this policy through a certain procedure, and having failed to win support on previous amendments, it is not now open for the leader of the official opposition to bring forward a third amendment to the budget.

In addition to that point, may I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 35 which reads:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of His Excellency or the person administering the Government of Canada;—

I am not suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has done that. I shall continue reading:

—nor use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof. No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

It seems to me crystal clear, if I may use a phrase frequently used by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that the House in a formal vote has already approved the budgetary policy of the government. Today the House is asked to declare these policies as inequitable and inadequate. If that is not a reflection upon