

Discussion on Point of Order

November 20, as recorded on page 4468 of *Hansard*:

This house regrets that the mismanagement of this government has endangered the rate of economic growth—

I suggest to you that the charge of mismanagement by the government is essentially the same in substance as the present amendment, which refers to the failure of the government to manage the economic system properly.

An hon. Member: You are wasting the time of the house.

Mr. Olson: The substance of these amendments is exactly the same. If you look at citation 194, Mr. Speaker, on page 164 of *Beauchesne*, you will find this:

A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided,—

It does not say the same wording; it says the same in substance.

—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.

The substance of this amendment has been before this house at least twice. For the record, just so hon. members opposite can be brought up to date, the substance of the amendment before the house on October 10 was negated by a vote of 113 to 68. This house therefore clearly indicated that it did not agree, for example, that the government has failed miserably to set an example of responsibility. The house voted against that proposition.

Mr. Nowlan: How did you vote at that time?

Mr. Olson: I forget the exact date when we were considering this amendment by the then leader of the opposition, which complained about mismanagement and failure to adjust taxes, which is the same in substance; but that amendment was negated by the house. I could go on and quote chapters from *Beauchesne* and from *May*, but I do not believe Your Honour needs to be convinced that the substance of any motion that has already been dealt with by the house cannot be brought forward again during the same session. This amendment is clearly out of order.

In addition to citation 194, there is citation 200 in *Beauchesne* which 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."

Then the author goes on to explain this proposition.

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 suggest therefore, Mr. Speaker, that you rule accordingly. It is almost incredible to me that the opposition would not look up and at least read the amendments they have moved in this house to make sure that this amendment would be in order. When I was listening to the hon. member who moved the amendment, it seemed clear to me the kind of amendment he was going to try to move. I had quite a bit of time while he was rambling through a bunch of statistics to look up these other amendments and the citations supporting the argument I have made.

Mr. Ricard: You should have been listening instead.

Mr. Olson: I listened very carefully. I hope Your Honour will take into consideration particularly citations 194 and 200. I am sure you will be convinced then that the substance of this amendment the opposition is attempting to move is essentially the same as the last two amendments that have been before the house in this session.

Mr. Baldwin: I submit, to start with, that it is quite obvious the learned authors who wrote the present edition of *Beauchesne* could not have had in mind such an incredibly inept government as the one we have now. I want to congratulate the government on receiving such a brilliant addition to their ranks. Having in mind his days in opposition, and knowing what kind of government he would have to deal with, the hon. member obviously contemplated the kind of motion an intelligent, well informed opposition would make as an amendment. Obviously it would be a motion criticizing this government for its vacillation, and its failure to manage the economic and financial affairs of the country. He obviously was prepared for the kind of motion which it was the duty of an opposition party to move. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be in order to say that every day of every year which this government stays in power it