

asked for a much greater sum of money sight unseen than we did on the reserve portion of that borrowing authority Bill. The tradition of our Party is not to ask for money for projects that are not yet committed to. We were trying to trim the borrowing Bill, which we did, compared to the previous administration. Therefore, his point with regard to the comments made by the Hon. Member for London East are, I feel, without validity.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, it is always nice that we have opportunities in this Chamber to see back-benchers, Members of the book-ends, get up and speak. It is very rewarding indeed that they would avail themselves of an opportunity to stand up and say something. Whether it is relevant or not is another issue. I am happy that the Hon. Member stood in his place and made a comment. If he wishes the Opposition, particularly the Liberal Opposition, to give approval to expenditures for next year with regard to the borrowing authority, he had better put in place very clearly what the expenditure plan is going to be for this Government. We are not going to be hoodwinked, beaten or pushed around by 212 Tory Members of Parliament.

An Hon. Member: Who is the extra one?

Mr. Dingwall: I said 212 and there are 212. The Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) is in bed with those guys. He supports them. What other member of the New Democratic Party received a limousine? Who gave Eddie the limousine? It was the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). They are in bed together.

I am happy that the book-ends of the Conservative Party are finally recognizing that they have to get up and speak on behalf of their constituents and stop taking the directives of the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens), who is really the Minister of Finance because the Prime Minister has completely muzzled and cut away any credibility that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) may have. I appreciate the Member standing in his place. Notwithstanding that, I find his comments to be totally invalid.

Mr. Jepson: Mr. Speaker, London is very close to Stratford, but I say, having been to the Shakespearean theatre, I have never seen any greater theatrics from the Hon. Member behind me. However, just as the people were not fooled by the political rhetoric on September 4, neither are the people here in the House today. I can assure the Hon. Member that the Conservative Government is the one Government that will be accountable for its spending programs. It will be accountable not only to the Members of the House but to all Canadians.

• (1550)

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the Hon. Member is suggesting that the Government will be accountable. I would ask him, however, where is the legislation to back up the promise that the situation will be changed regarding moneys from workers' compensation payments being included for the purposes of calculating this GIS? Conservative Members promised to change that during the election campaign but

Old Age Security Act

to date nothing has been forthcoming. Where are the home-makers' pensions that they promised? Totally irresponsible—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The period for questions and comments is now over. Resuming debate.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate, albeit briefly, in this debate. What is at issue today is not whether or not one is in favour of this Bill. I would presume that all Hon. Members must be in favour of giving needy people more money. But what is at issue is the fact that this Government is forgetting something. It is forgetting a large group of people. Large numbers of people are being forgotten by the Conservative Party. I still have some difficulty in figuring out who will be in and who will be out of this program.

Mrs. Maily: You don't know how to analyse it.

Mr. Boudria: I am told that this is because we cannot analyse these things properly. Perhaps those who have such a keen understanding of those issues can answer the following questions. We understand that widows will now be receiving the pension. That is fairly straightforward. They will receive the pension providing, of course, that they are between the ages of 60 and 65 and are in need.

Mr. Hawkes: And widowers.

Mr. Boudria: And widowers too although there are fewer widowers than widows. However, that is the case as well.

Let us look at the following situations. What happens in the case of people who are not married? Of course, these people will not receive benefits. It could be that people were living common-law and became widowed. They will not receive benefits. They could have as many financial obligations and children to support as other widows but they will not be eligible. What happens in the case of a widow who has remarried? Of course, we are told that a widow who has remarried is no longer a widow. That is fine. However, what happens in the case of a widow who has remarried and subsequently divorces? When a person divorces, does she not revert to the marital status she had prior to that last wedding? That would mean that that person would become a widow again. Does that person qualify for these benefits or does she not?

This legislation is so full of holes that I venture to say that the Government will never be able to administer it in its present form. We cannot even understand how it works. It is a virtual impossibility. We are told that other people cannot be included under the program in the name of economic restraint. We are told that single people, separated people and divorced people between the ages of 60 and 65 who in many cases are in as dire need as widows and widowers, will not be eligible. Why is this so? It is so in the name of restraint.

The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) gave us a lecture on how he claims the Liberal Party