

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I was in the House but did not hear the explanations of the hon. member who wanted to raise a question of privilege. It is rather difficult for me to judge whether there was indeed a question of privilege. I am referring to Standing Order 17(2) which provides for a question of privilege to be raised at the first opportunity. I do not know, however, what the hon. member was going to say, so it is difficult for me to decide whether he was raising a question of privilege. I respectfully suggest that he be heard.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I think—I am listening and it is precisely what hon. members are saying and the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau), and I quote, said he had been misquoted. If one refers to Standing Order 37, one can see that a debate cannot be interrupted and above all that a member who has had the floor cannot speak again to say that he has been misquoted. I therefore recognize the member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre).

[*English*]

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege.

Mr. Corbin: You have to listen to him, Mr. Speaker. He has to be heard.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Oh!

Mr. Nystrom: Name him.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I have recognized the hon. member for Calgary Centre and I have ruled there was no question of privilege; therefore, I cannot entertain any discussion on the matter. The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Stanfield: Filibuster.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Gloucester on a point of order.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members would just keep quiet, I am just trying to make a point. I do not want to question your decision—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, you said in your ruling that I had said that I was misquoted. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I had not said that. I said that the hon. member for Calgary Centre was misrepresenting what I said. I believe that a member—

● (2102)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I read from Standing Order 37:

(1) No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood,

Borrowing Authority Act

but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, before I was so rudely interrupted five or six times I was saying the hon. member's contention that the dollar has dropped because of evil speculators is nonsense. The dollar has dropped in value because Canada's inflation rate is higher than most other western industrialized countries. Our government is running a deficit higher than any other country, with the exception of Italy, and the international monetary fund has no confidence in this government's ability to run the economy. That is why the dollar is dropping, and the parliamentary secretary knows that full well. He knows exactly why the dollar is dropping in value and why we are running the huge kind of trade deficit we have.

There were a few other remarks made by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) that I would like to touch on. His opening statement made reference to the fact that it was perfectly reasonable—in fact, it was more than reasonable, it was highly desirable—for the government to involve itself physically in the economy, to borrow money and to take money from the state, spread it out and do good works on behalf of the people of Canada. That was his statement. He said that anyone who opposed that was really being mean and cruel.

I would like to remind the hon. member of a speech made by his leader on August 1. That is not long ago and he should be able to remember that far back. They were planning an election at the time but maybe this is only valid during pre-election periods and we should not believe what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said after he has changed his mind about an election. He said, however:

We will be cutting \$2 billion from current and planned expenditures . . .

According to the hon. member for Gloucester, what the Prime Minister said he was going to be doing when he spoke on August 1 is exactly the wrong thing to do. The Prime Minister also said:

We will achieve zero growth in the federal public service.

The hon. member for Gloucester thinks that is terrible. But that is what the Prime Minister promised on national television on August 1. The Prime Minister went on to say:

We will remove the intrusions of many government policies and regulations from individuals and businesses—

That is what the Prime Minister promised on national television on August 1. Continuing, he said:

—in some cases this will mean returning functions to the private sector—

That is what the Prime Minister promised. And again the speech continues:

—in others it will mean removing the heavy hand of government and its drag on personal initiatives.

He said that on national television.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!