

*Borrowing Authority Act*

words which were spoken. However, if, as the parliamentary secretary says, the words were to the effect that his remarks were not factual or were misleading, that is not necessarily unparliamentary. It becomes unparliamentary if the hon. member says the misleading was done intentionally.

**Mr. Beatty:** Which he did not say.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** If it is just a matter of opinion, and as long as the hon. member did not attach a qualification regarding intentional misleading, that is permitted by the rules. Such words are used regularly in the House. If the hon. member pursues his insinuation or reflection on the remarks of the parliamentary secretary, I might have to decide otherwise.

**Mr. McKenzie:** I have no problem qualifying my remarks, Mr. Speaker. I would never make a statement like that without going into it a little deeper. I suggest that the parliamentary secretary listen to me for a few minutes before he starts challenging me.

The parliamentary secretary said that the Conservative party would fire many civil servants. We have never at any time said we would fire many civil servants. We said we would not hire any more civil servants. We feel that half a million is enough.

I listened to the adjournment debate here last week. Two members of the Liberal party, the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) and the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), were pleading with the government not to fire any civil servants. It is the Liberals who will be firing civil servants, not us. We have said we would not hire any more.

The parliamentary secretary discussed whether we supported social legislation in the last parliament. We certainly did support social legislation. We had to support social legislation in the last parliament because of double digit inflation. That was what the last election was about. Our incomes and prices policy was designed to assist the five million people who were below the poverty line and who needed assistance. It was the Conservative party which showed leadership in the last federal election in dealing with the underprivileged and with the need for proper legislation to help people.

I listened to the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who said that the best parliament we have ever had in this country was the last parliament. He spoke of all the great legislation which was passed. I found his comments very strange, because it was an NDP motion of non-confidence which brought the government down. That motion was not presented by us. If the last parliament was so wonderful and if the legislation was so great, why on earth did the NDP present a motion of non-confidence to bring the government down?

The parliamentary secretary said that for the last number of years the federal government has been Liberal. That is quite true. The Canadian people have been very generous and tolerant with this government, but that is coming to an end. The by-elections proved that. The parliamentary secretary has much praise for this government. I am sure he must have

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

campaigning in Toronto. I am sure he must have gone from door to door praising this government. If he did, I wonder why the Liberals did not sweep Toronto.

The parliamentary secretary spoke about how great things are in this country. Unemployment costs us \$8 billion a year. Over \$4 billion is spent on the unemployment insurance plan and \$2 billion on welfare, and \$2 billion in taxes is lost. The parliamentary secretary says he is proud of that. He says that that is just great, and that it is terrible we should mention it.

If the rules had never been changed, we would not need this borrowing authority bill. Since 1963 parliament has not had effective control of public expenditures. The Auditor General has said that the Liberal government has lost control or is close to losing effective control of the public purse. In a subsequent report he stated that he felt very strongly about the fact—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Regional Economic Expansion—Funding of land registration and information service; the hon. member for South Western Nova (Miss Campbell)—Fisheries—Depletion of inshore lobster fishery; the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez)—Public works—Construction of taxation centre at Sudbury, Ont.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

**CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 2), 1976**

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North)** moved that Bill C-202, to amend the Criminal Law Amendment Act (No. 2),