

• (1530)

Again as reported in *Hansard* for February 13 at page 1225, the hon. member for York South, persisting in his interest in this matter, said:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance on another topic. It arises out of the report of a survey of corporate profits for 1972. In view of the fact that this survey shows an increase in corporate profits of 20 per cent in 1972 over 1971 . . . is the minister reconsidering the additional concessions to what I have called the corporate welfare bums that he suggested last May?

On three other occasions this clear distinction was made, and it was repeated in the 1973 budget. I submit to the Chair it cannot be suggested that distinction is not to be made between the budgetary proposals of May 1972 and the budget of 1973. What we did in challenging the budgetary policy of 1972—not the policies but the budgetary policy—was to vote against the policy contained in that budget. If what the minister contends is given effect to, this would be the result. Once the motion has been passed there is a complete taboo. No hon. member would be able to discuss any of the areas relating to the budgetary proposals which are the subject of the motion. However, I will make this admission. If we had brought into this House a motion couched in identical terms as the motion with which we sought to amend the budget, then a very good case might well be made out for saying that citation 200 read by the government House leader, and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would apply. But that is not the case.

If you take the situation that would result from the application of the budgetary proposals of May 1972, and add to it the proposals contained in this 1973 budget, then by putting them together we can say that the combination is such that, in the terms of this motion, it does not constitute "an adequate and equitable response to the needs of the country". I submit to Your Honour that it would take a great stretching, a great torturing of those words to permit you to say to the Leader of the Opposition, in a matter as important as the granting of supply, an issue that traditionally and historically goes back so far it has become woven into the tapestry of our parliamentary structure, that because of the terms of this motion we are prohibited from continuing debate.

I could take more time, Mr. Speaker, but my point is that the government is inhibiting the opposition's opportunities to place before the House the substance of this motion. I conclude by pointing out that there are many instances of motions having been moved by members of the New Democratic Party, and by members of the Creditistes party, dealing with matters that constituted part of a preceding budget. In no way and at no time was it suggested on those occasions that it was not competent for a member to proceed with the motion, have it discussed, the question put and the views of the House recorded.

I leave the matter with Your Honour, but I repeat that I take the most serious view of the attempt to further restrict the very limited opportunities that exist for members of this House to have the right to challenge the government in respect of supply. If we are prohibited from proceeding with a motion of this kind, then as far as I can see the whole business of supply and the rights of the opposition might just as well go out of the window.

### *Effect of Budgetary Proposals*

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I take a very serious view of the procedural point that we are debating this afternoon. I feel very strongly that Your Honour should find this motion out of order.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** No doubt.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** But before there are any catcalls, may I make it perfectly clear—I suppose I should say crystal clear—that we of the New Democratic Party are not in the least embarrassed by this motion. We regard it as somewhat silly, as an attempt to go both ways, but we will be quite happy to have it debated. We want to see the issue ventilated, and if Your Honour sees fit to allow this motion procedurally, we shall be quite happy to vote against it when it is called at 9.45 tonight.

May I point out that among the points of confusion and contradiction contained in the motion is the very clear suggestion that the corporate tax reductions proposed in 1972 are not adequate. What the sponsors of this motion want, Mr. Speaker, is an even greater reduction in corporate tax than that proposed by the Minister of Finance. We do not take that position. Therefore, if this motion comes to a vote, there is no question where we stand: we are opposed to it.

Speaking of the motion, may I point out that there is an interesting citation in *Beauchesne*, which I admit relates to amendments but I think should also apply to motions. It is to be found in *Beauchesne's Fourth Edition* at page 171, citation 203(1), and I should like to read the relevant sentence:

Every amendment—

As I say, this deals with amendments but I think it should also apply to motions.

—proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

I submit that this motion does not meet that criterion. On the one hand, it seeks to convey the impression that it is a vote against the corporate tax reduction, and therefore it is supposed to trap us. On the other hand, it leaves the way open for the Progressive Conservatives to say that when the vote does come on the corporate tax reduction they can vote against it because they want a greater reduction. I suggest that kind of playing fast and loose with the procedures of this House does not become a group of men and women who are known as the Official Opposition in this House of Commons. Apart from my procedural objection to this motion, I think it is stupid. I think it would be a waste of time to have a debate on this motion today, but as I say my main concern is that I think it is procedurally wrong.

Although I had intended to leave this part of my argument to the end, I am switching my thoughts and I shall deal with it now. I want to deal with the main argument advanced by the hon. member for Peace River. His contention is that there is an ancient and sacred right that permits the House of Commons to have a redress of grievances before supply is granted. When any hon. member of this House stands up and talks about ancient rules, I am with him.