

Borrowing Authority Act

● (1630)

It is a very difficult situation for a Member whose riding contains hundreds of families that own small businesses or farms and are finding themselves pushed to the brink of bankruptcy at this time. My constituents come to their Member of Parliament and say: "Why has the economy progressed in such a fashion that even though I am managing my business in a proper fashion and have been doing so for 10, 15 or 30 years, I now find myself in this kind of difficulty?" The only answer I can give to them is that they have a national Government that does not know how to manage the funds of the taxpayers of the country.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we had the unaccustomed pleasure of hearing two government back-benchers speak at this stage of the debate. The only time they dared appear is after the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren) had served notice of limitation of time of debate. Therefore, they could safely enter the debate because their interventions of whatever nature would not interfere with the flow of the business of the House.

The Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaiël) attempted to justify the Liberal Party, as he has attempted to justify it in the past, by indicating that anything that the Liberal Party or administration does, as long as it will maintain the Liberals in power, is good for the Liberal Party.

● (1630)

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaiël) on a point of order.

Mr. Gimaiël: Mr. Speaker, I never said what the Hon. Member has just said. I never said anything about the Liberal Party being prepared to do anything to cling to power. If the Hon. Member is quoting me, I would urge him to be accurate, because the people of his riding would like to keep fond memories of him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is so unfamiliar with the Standing Orders that he cannot tell the difference between a point of order and a point of debate. I am prepared to debate with the Hon. Member at any time, but when it comes to procedure he ought to restrict his points of order to that subject.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would ask Hon. Members to cooperate. When the Chair gives the floor to a Member to make a speech—the Standing Orders are clear and Hon. Members were so advised many times—the Hon. Member who has the floor must not be interrupted. In any case, the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean is again raising a point of order.

Mr. Gimaiël: Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with the fact that I have no objection against my colleagues quoting me in the House. However, they should repeat what I said, not something I did not say, especially when it is the last speech of the Member involved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member wanted to clarify his remarks, and that is quite acceptable. The Hon. Member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Lambert: I want to say to the Chair that those are points of procedure, not simply points of debate. So, Mr. Speaker, they are asking—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry, but the Hon. Member for Edmonton West has just said something about the Chair which may or may not be acceptable. However, the Standing Orders are clear on that point. If a Member is not quoted correctly—that is in the Standing Orders and I will be pleased to find the exact reference—that Member may rise on a point of order to set the record straight. Therefore, I have nothing more to say. The point raised by the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean was quite in order and I would ask the Hon. Member for Edmonton West to continue his remarks.

Mr. Lambert: I do not want to insist, Mr. Speaker, but if you care to check *Hansard* and reflect upon what I said to you, I think you will agree with me.

But then, on the other hand—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is another point of order. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Mr. Dubois: Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to see that a parliamentarian with as much experience as the Hon. Member has does not show respect for the Chair, and I would suggest that you ask the Hon. Member for Edmonton West to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please! If the Hon. Members will bear with me, I do not think it will be necessary to go that far. However, I would like to quote the relevant Standing Order to which I referred a moment ago, namely Standing Order 41(1) on page 33, which provides the following:

No Member, unless otherwise provided by Standing or Special Order, may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his or her speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, and the Member is not to introduce any new matter, but then no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

As I understand it, the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaiël) wanted to clarify an interpretation which was different from what he claims having said earlier in his speech. The matter is therefore settled and I invite the Hon. Member for Edmonton West to resume his comments.