## The Budget-Mr. Stevens

consumption, it artificially built up the buying power of the nation, which resulted in the inflation which plagued Great Britain for many years. On the other hand, that same force—

Mr. Cosgrove: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been troubled for the last two or three minutes about a comment used and language used by the—

Mr. Epp: They are coming to get you, Paul.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will have to delay his point of order.

## THE ROYAL ASSENT

[Translation]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Deputy Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

(2020)

And being returned:

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Honour, the Deputy to the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, his Honour was pleased to give in Her Majesty's name Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-112, an act to amend the statute law relating to certain taxes—Chapter No. 104;

Bill C-101, an act to amend the Petro-Canada Act, Chapter No. 105;

Bill C-102, an act to amend the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources Act, Chapter No. 106;

Bill C-104, an act respecting petroleum incentives and Canadian ownership and control determination and to amend the Foreign Investment Review Act, Chapter No. 107.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion (Mr. MacEachen) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government and the amendment of Mr. Wilson (p. 18905) and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Riis (p. 18908).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cosgrove) was rising on a point of order.

Mr. Cosgrove: Mr. Speaker, at the first opportunity after listening to a descriptive word which was used by the member who has the floor in this debate, I looked through the rules for what words are permissible and what words are not permissible in this House. I am not anxious to repeat the word because I found it indecent. I thought it unbecoming to this Parliament and I thought it unbecoming that it be uttered in a public place. The word was a description of what is known as a house of ill repute. It is not shown in the section on language that is not permissible, but I would not want the occasion to go by lest it be thought that all members who were in the House at the time the word was used, found it acceptable or becoming to this institution. There are children in the gallery this evening and there may be some children in Canada watching these proceedings on television.

I object to the use of that word as unbecoming to this place and I would ask that you consider whether the word is indecent and therefore not permissible as parliamentary language.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The matter of deciding what is parliamentary or unparliamentary is sometimes difficult. In the opinion of the Chair the language was offensive but it was not unparliamentary. I would call to the attention of the hon. member who has the floor that the language he used hardly brought dignity or credit to the House of Commons, and I ask that he refrain from such language.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not comment on your ruling. During the dinner break I had an opportunity to read the relevant section in Beauchesne and of course I consulted the Oxford dictionary. I think it would be most enlightening for all members of the House to look to the Oxford dictionary for the word I used and upon which you commented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would invite the hon. member to proceed to the debate. I do not think it is to the advantage of the hon. members or to the House to have a discussion on the matter.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue with the main thrust of what I was saying. We have had a scenario in which the government, starting in 1968, has consistently put expenditure programs in place. In this it was substantially aided and abetted by the NDP. The culmination of all this is the type of budget that we received yesterday evening. I think it would be relevant to put a few statistics on the record. The net result of the budget is that we will now find that government spending this year will equal \$8,251 per taxpayer, compared to only \$1,692 per taxpayer in 1967-68, the year