

Discussion on Point of Order

can make a mistake at the outset, by suggesting it.

That is why I feel the premises of the hon. member for Medicine Hat are clearly unsound and the amendment should be accepted, because I fail to see how it could be similar to others.

We are faced today with another unusual situation: an increase in taxes which was not mentioned in the other two amendments. That is why I think the amendment is quite in order.

[English]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Your Honour is in the position of having to pioneer a bit. The rules under which we operate, and which are the basis for the citations that Beauchesne gives us contemplated only one budget a year.

Mr. Pascoe: Not three.

Mr. Knowles: No more than one at any rate. As a matter of fact, we have had to agree in the house that, though standing order 58, which sets out the rules relating to the budget speaks of "the budget presentation", when we have a second budget in the same session we have to deal with it under the same rule. I suggest therefore that the citations and pronouncements relating to the old situation, where there was only one budget a year, do not help Your Honour very much today.

The fact is that today we have a new budget, and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) has proposed an amendment dealing with a new situation. Despite the fact that the amendment is several lines in length, it really hinges on this concept—and I quote from the amendment—"and has now proposed an increase in taxes". Thus the amendment relates itself, and I say in its entirety to an increase in taxes that has now been proposed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp). Because this is a new situation, Mr. Speaker, I suggest you cannot rely on the citations which envisage a session in which only one budget is brought down.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that you are going to have to give some pretty serious thought to the citations that say in general that the same subject cannot be dealt with a second time. But I do not think you will have trouble with that, because what is being commented on now is something that was not before us when the previous amendments were moved, namely an increase in taxes proposed by the Minister of Finance last

Thursday night. It is in this new situation that the amendment has been made, and I believe, all things considered, Your Honour will have to find that this amendment is in order.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who indicates quite clearly that what we have here is a new budget with new resolutions and that, in these circumstances, the amendment of the Conservative party is quite in order.

Furthermore, the member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) should know from experience that when he sat with the Cr ditistes, here, amendments were moved against the government and substantially, Social Credit proposals were always included in such amendments. At that time, the member for Medicine Hat did not object to the Chair accepting these amendments. Today, he is objecting because he has become a Liberal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this exceptional situation should be taken into account when a member prefers to set his electors aside and join a political party which is not supported by his own voters.

[English]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has already spoken once to the point of order.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I feel you are in a rather difficult position in reaching a decision at this stage.

Mr. R gimbal: Not at all. You are.

Mr. Sharp: The reason I say that I understand you may have some difficulty is not only for the technical reason spoken to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), but also for the reason of substance.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the first budget debate the position members condemned the government at a time when we reduced taxes for exactly the same reasons that they are now condemning us for increasing taxes. It must be very difficult for you, Mr. Speaker, to distinguish between the cases, and I think it does indicate that even though there appears to have been a change in leadership, it is just the same old group arguing the same old platitudes.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.