

on days when there has been no vote, Your Honour has taken the view that you had to show leniency and had to extend latitude. I suspect you have even done it for us, but that has always been done on the understanding that the matter was not coming to a vote.

Your Honour may feel that today you should exercise some of that latitude, but I submit that to do that on a day when theoretically it would be possible for the House to make a decision which would be the very opposite of a decision it made a week ago makes this procedural point a very serious one, and I urge that you should not allow this for these procedural reasons.

I still get these interjections from here and there, but this is not embarrassing to us as we are happy to have the issue ventilated, and happy to get up and be counted as to where we stand on this motion. I do not want to offend the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate, but perhaps I can go on.

I think we should note again some of the citations, even though the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) did draw attention to them. On page 164 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition we find the basic rule set out in Citation 194(1) which reads:

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.

I point out, Sir, that not only do we have the fact that this House voted on the general budgetary motion moved by the Minister of Finance, we also have the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) in these words:

While acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals—

They always like to have it both ways, don't they? Let me continue:

—this House regrets that they do not contain measures that will substantially reduce continuing high unemployment, effectively contain the spiralling cost of living or provide any incentives to Canadians to increase their participation in Canadian business enterprise and development.

• (1550)

Now they ask us to pass an opinion on the budget because it does not constitute an adequate and equitable response to the needs of the country. I ask, what is the difference between talking about the needs of the country in general terms and spelling out such things as unemployment, inflation and so on. On all counts we are being asked to debate again, and take a decision on, the same subject matter and points on which we took decisions when we were on the budget debate.

An hon. Member: What about old age pensions?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If my hon. friend wants to get into the matter of old age pensions, of course, if this motion should be ruled out of order I suppose we shall be back on government business and back on the subject of old age pensions today. Perhaps that is what my hon. friend wants. At pages 167 and 168 there are

Effect of Budgetary Proposals

found citations about reviving debate. Citation 200 (1), which is the one to which the minister referred, reads:

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.

I also point out, Sir, that our standing orders include Standing Order 61 which is very clear. It reads:

Only one amendment and one subamendment may be made to a motion proposed in the Budget Debate or to a motion proposed under an Order of the Day for the consideration of the business of supply on an allotted day.

We have had the one motion, the one amendment and the one subamendment to the budget debate and for the Leader of the Opposition to try to drag in another one, no matter what he proposes to call it, is a violation of the sacred rules, traditions and rights of this House. If we are to be in this position where we can give a decision one week and have it opened again the next week, I submit that something has gone wrong with the procedures of this House.

Although I repeat what I have said, that we find no problem in so far as this debate is concerned, the Conservatives are trying to embarrass us and, failing in that, are trying to prepare the ground so that when the corporate tax reductions come up they can vote against them because they will say they are not big enough. We will not fall into the trap. Neither are we going along with their proposition for even greater corporate tax cuts. In any case, Sir, we leave the decision in your hands.

Some hon. Members: Hurrah!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hear some of my friends saying "Hurrah". I could add something, but I shall not. The plain fact of the matter, of which Your Honour is well aware, is that this is a very serious procedural point. I do not think since our new rules came into effect that there has been a procedural point of this kind in respect of an opposition motion on a non-confidence day. There have been procedural points on other than non-confidence days, but this may well be the first of this kind and I submit the seriousness of violating the rules against reviving an issue on which a decision of parliament has been taken is a very important matter. Therefore, Sir, I hope you will find that this motion goes beyond the rights accorded by the rules to members of this House and that you will rule accordingly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, after the comments of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and of the hon. member of Winnipeg-North-Centre (Mr. Knowles) about the acceptability of this motion, I am surprised to see that its subject matter has already caused some discussions.

To start my comments, I would like to remind my colleagues that we must make a distinction between the subject matter and the form of this motion, and even if the New Democratic Party finds that the form is ridicu-