

Government Orders

The government will argue that it will be saving money by introducing this bill. Judy Rebick says that by the government's own figures it is going to save \$900 million through the cut in voluntary quits and firings. Of that, \$400 million will go to businesses for the government to pay their premiums for new hires. We are now talking about \$500 million, and out of the \$500 million—I know a little bit about security, of what new security systems cost in every UI office—we could estimate that we are talking about several million—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry, I have to interrupt the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam. She will have the time remaining for her speech as soon as the Speaker has addressed the House.

* * *

• (1645)

POINT OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: First of all, I thank the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam for her courtesy in allowing me to interrupt her on a matter which I wish I did not have to address but which I do.

Earlier today I made a remark with respect to an exchange that was taking place in the House, a remark which I was wrong in making, in which I asked the question whether or not the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Yukon, was supporting the position of our colleague who was involved in the dispute.

I want to say to my colleague, the hon. member for Yukon and the leader of the New Democratic Party, that I was absolutely wrong in saying that. I knew I was wrong as soon as I said it. That is why I did not say anything further about it.

I hope my colleague will accept my apologies and I hope her colleagues will accept my apology. I am conscious of the statement made in the Chamber by our colleague and long-time friend of mine, the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona. I hope he will feel that this apology is adequate and satisfactory.

I sometimes have to ask members to apologize and it is probably fitting that once in a while a Speaker has to do the same thing.

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you very much for that. Of course I accept your words and your apology.

I think all of us understand that from time to time there are things we might change in what we have said, but I think it is with great honour to your office that you have on this occasion clarified the record. I appreciate it very much and I thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will be resuming debate. There are 13 minutes left for the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam.

* * *

**GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES RESTRAINT ACT,
1993 NO. 2**

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-113, an act to provide for government expenditure restraint, be read the third time and passed.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I was in the process of quoting remarks made by Judy Rebick from the NAC in appearing before the committee on Bill C-113. I was outlining the costs she saw under this bill: "There will be an additional 200 appeal workers and estimates are that it will be more than that because of the increase that happened when the penalties were placed. There was a huge increase in appeals, from a few a week to constant every day appeals. We are now going to have even more under this new legislation because people are being thrown off UI altogether.

How much money is really being saved? Very little. We do not believe this is a deficit reduction, member. We believe it is a political attack on unemployed people, on women and an attempt to bring our UI system into harmony with the American UI system".

I would like to introduce something into my remarks and read it into the record for the benefit of those unemployment help centres across the country that are advocacy centres and for those who just might be watching and want to know what their rights are under this bill. I would like to read into the record a few instructions that are proposed in a booklet called "For a Just Cause". It is a UI handbook produced for workers by workers. It is printed by the Public Service Alliance of Canada and it is from UI workers whose wages, I might add, were frozen at zero for the next two years by this bill.