

You, Sir, are in the position of being the protector of parliament, the preserver of its great traditions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The members of the Liberal party laugh. They do not regard you that way. There is no question whatever as to what the rule says. There is equally, as I see it, no question that the hon. member for Peace River has fully answered the suggestions that were made to the contrary by the President of the Privy Council. When the President of the Privy Council and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre spoke of parliament and what it meant, I looked over at the government benches. What they have done in the past few years to parliament is to degrade it to a degree that has never been equaled in all the history of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The President of the Privy Council says that we must maintain the rules. These rules are not the laws of the Medes and the Persians. These rules are designed to ensure that this institution shall be the protector of freedom and that we shall have the fullest opportunity to examine supply. We do not have it today. Is parliament then effective today? Somebody asked me a moment ago whether it was fluid like this on other days. The fluidity of parliament today reminds me of a dried up creek in the month of July. There is practically no right left with us.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, geese not eagles saved ancient Rome. I hear these hon. gentlemen acting the part of geese. I will remind them that they will not save their government by this kind of conduct. Today, have we any control over our expenditure in this country?

Some hon. Members: None.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As a result of closure, this institution has been emasculated—it is a eunuch. There is no examination of expenditures. The expenditures go to committees. When the committees sit, the press is not there; nobody speaks out, and the result is that the various departmental estimates come back here. Do we get any chance here to speak about them? There is not an opportunity. I think of that awful scene of a few months ago when we voted through \$16 billion in four and a half hours because the rules imposed by closure had actually determined the denial of the right of parliament to examination. Every time there is any motion tabled, these people stand up and parade as the lovers of parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP have nothing to fear. They are going to leave the conscientious declarations that they made throughout the election at the door of parliament. They will vote in support of what they condemned with all their hearts and souls. I ask you, Sir, on the basis of the argument advanced by the hon. member for Peace River not to continue this degradation of parliament. That is what it is. Do we get a chance to raise anything under Standing Order 43 any more? Nothing of the kind. On every resolution that comes up we hear the "nos" from the

Effect of Budgetary Proposals

Liberal party. Are we able to advance our efforts in regard to expenditures? The answer is no. The last opportunity we have is through the medium of amendments, because those amendments will embarrass the New Democratic Party.

• (1610)

Their joint allies, the government, decided to raise the question of the illegality of the amendment in question and at the same time the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) gets up and says "I don't care what you do, Mr. Speaker, we are going to vote against it".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if I remember the last words of the argument put forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), he stated the motion moved by the Progressive Conservative party today was identical to that moved during the budget debate, he was compelled to admit that the motion would surely be out of order.

He also said that just the same there were a few differences between the motion introduced today and that brought in during the budget debate. However, it seems obvious that both motions have something in common, namely that both specified that the budget presented by the government was unsatisfactory and that, consequently, the government had lost the confidence of the House. Now, to maintain today that the motion moved by his party is different from the one introduced last week is absolutely false and I will not make any other comment in that connection.

I will only quote four excerpts from Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition*; the first one appears at page 137 and reads as follows:

A mere alteration of the words of a question without any substantial change in its object will not be sufficient to evade the rule that no question shall be offered which is substantially the same as one which has already been expressed in the present session.

At page 164, citation 194 reads as follows, and I quote:

(1) A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House. This rule applies to the decision taken on amendments to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. A question once put cannot be altered by the member moving it, without the consent of the House. The reconsideration of a question already decided is not allowed under British parliamentary practice, but it prevails in many public bodies and societies.

Also, at page 164, citation 200 reads as follows:

(1) 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.

Finally, at page 172, the Speaker's ruling is commented thus: