

Discussion on Point of Order

would be competent for us to move a motion, if the machinery were provided, to the effect that the government, by its vacillation and failure to manage the economic and financial affairs of the country, no longer commanded the confidence of the people.

However, I do want to point out that the operative part of the amendment is that which states that the government has now proposed increases in taxes to meet governmental extravagance. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is the second budget during this session. Surely in a situation where the government has seen fit, for reasons to which the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) has alluded, to bring in a budget proposing increases in taxes, to which we take legitimate objection, we are entitled to say we object because the government, in its actions leading up to the proposal to add to the tax burdens of the Canadian people, has vacillated in its policy and mismanaged the financial and economic affairs of the country.

How else would it be possible for us to take exception to the government's most unwise and unjust proposal to increase taxation, without referring to the reasons why, in our opinion, it was necessary to do so? This is the second budget in one session. Surely if the rules make any sense at all they permit us to make a motion of this kind, a motion of non-confidence in the government, and to give our reasons for doing so without any reference to an amendment that may have been moved before.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I believe the only reason the question is being debated at the present time as to the acceptability or otherwise of this motion is that the question was raised by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson). In substance he was trying to point out something that is well known in this house. Certainly the hon. member is not so incredibly naïve as to believe that the members of the opposition are not well aware of motions made in this house on any and all subjects.

• (4:10 p.m.)

May I point out that the chief complaint of the hon. member was against the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) on November 20. That motion dealt with the rate of economic growth: There is no mention in this motion of the rate of economic growth. The earlier motion mentions the prospects of satisfactory levels of employment: The present motion says nothing about the levels of employment. Then the

[Mr. Baldwin.]

motion of November 20 refers to the ability of individual Canadians to meet their own commitments: That is not mentioned in the motion now before us.

As my colleague from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) indicated, Mr. Speaker, this motion protests against the government increasing taxes after the delivery of a budget speech by the minister. This is an entirely new matter and is now before the house. The government proposes a tax increase. The motion objects to this tax increase and to the fact that the economic tool proposed by the government will not achieve the end for which it is designed. That is the substance of the motion.

Merely because use is made a second time of the same words in a descriptive or ancillary way, such as "inflationary", "economic" and "the government" does not vitiate the validity of the amendment, so the argument put forward by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) is reduced to absurdity. I put it to Your Honour that the operative part of the motion, as indicated by my colleague from Peace River, protests against an increase in taxes and also suggests that the increase in taxes will not achieve the end desired by the government. It has nothing to do with any previous motions before the house during this session.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the argument put forward by the hon. members for Edmonton West and Peace River (Messrs. Lambert and Baldwin).

It is obvious that the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) could have quoted every section in Beauchesne to no avail; he erred in his original premise, when he said that this amendment was identical in concept and substance to the two previous amendments. It is not the same thing at all. As a matter of fact, his argument is entirely wrong, since the premises are false.

Here, the objection is against those tax increases. In the other two amendments, there was no mention of them at all. It may be that like causes produce unlike effects, but the difference lies in that today's amendment is concerned with tax increases, while the others dealt with the increase in the cost of living. Similar causes can bring about different results and I wonder how the hon. member for Medicine Hat can reach the conclusion that it is in principle exactly the same amendment. It is astonishing to see how he