

*Family Allowances Act, 1973*

Churchill (Mr. Murphy) has referred to false statements of Members of this Party, and I am sure that is unparliamentary. Now he is introducing a totally different Bill into the debate which is on an amendment to Bill C-132. I would hope you would call him to order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The second point of the Hon. Member is well taken. The first point with respect to reflections in general on Members of another Party, it seems to me, has been part of the tradition of Parliament for many years. But the second point which the Hon. Member raised appears to have some validity. Would the Hon. Member for Churchill please take note.

**Mr. Murphy:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, why I wish to refer to Bill C-133 is because I believe—

**Mr. Clarke:** Order.

**Mr. Murphy:** If I may, Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that Bills C-131, C-132 and C-133 are not only consequential but are part of the same package, and I wish to explain how we are approaching it, which is not just as one Bill but as one of three Bills which are part of that same package. What I wish to say, and I will be very short, Mr. Speaker, is this: we in the New Democratic Party, the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) and myself, have managed to get the agreement of Conservative and Liberal Members to prevent Bill C-133 from coming back to this House prior to the Christmas break. That is constructive criticism, that is constructive fighting, and that is the type of work which should really be going on in this House of Commons. We have the unanimous agreement of a parliamentary committee studying one of the Bills which brings in the six and five legislation. We not only got the support of the one or two Conservative Members who showed up finally at that meeting, but we got the support of all the Liberal members who showed up for that committee meeting. We had a quorum and we all agreed that that Bill will not come back and will not be voted upon until after Christmas. That is constructive criticism and the way this House should be working. It should not be a matter of rhetoric where the Conservatives say they are going to take the Government to the wall, and then only one to four of their Members are in the House. That is not constructive criticism. It is not a matter of having only one speaker today, December 20, in opposition to a Government measure. If what the various critics for the Conservative Party have said that they would be fighting this Bill, were true, they would have more than one speaker up today. They would be fighting this legislation, because it only takes a few more speakers to kill this Bill.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Hawkes:** I am sure the Hon. Member would not like to mislead the House. There has been more than one speaker for the Conservative Party today, and we have spent more time in the two days of this debate than the New Democratic Party cumulatively have spent so far.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Calgary West has made the point that there was more than one speaker of his Party today. The Hon. Member for Churchill has the floor.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be in the position of giving the wrong impression in this House. If there were two Conservatives who got up today, I am certainly willing to give the Conservative Party credit for putting up two speakers to our seven.

**An Hon. Member:** One was invisible.

**Mr. Murphy:** I do wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are the Party which has one-third the membership of the Conservatives, and, therefore, if we put up seven speakers, they should have put up 21. It is not the other way around, that we put up seven and they put up two. And all the previous speaker had pointed out is that the Conservatives have put up two speakers. As my hon. friend, the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell), our critic on this particular piece of legislation, has pointed out, we are not debating the Government Bill, we are debating the Conservative amendment to the legislation, and they are not even here to speak on their own amendment. They are invisible in this House. And if they continue that, they will be invisible after the next election.

I do not want to spend all my time talking about the absenteeism of the Conservatives, or about the fact they speak big, but not very often. I want to talk about the legislation itself. I am not speaking directly to the amendment, I am speaking to the proposed legislation. This legislation, which my seatmate, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle), talked about as being a measure which he would expect from Scrooge at Christmas, is also a measure which shows that the Government has come down to a very low level in terms of its Government's policy. It is an example of a Government that no longer talks about economic leadership. It is an example of a Government that no longer talks about providing social justice.

I have mentioned in this House a couple of times, and I am ashamed of it now, but out of pure honesty I will say it, that I voted for the Liberal Party in 1968 because of what it was saying in 1968. Some of my colleagues said that that will probably kill me in Western Canada, and they are probably right, but let me tell you that in those years the Liberals talked about social justice, about a just society. But we look at this legislation now and it is the exact opposite of the platform of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) at that time. This legislation is not about those who can afford to sacrifice. It does not talk about those who need help getting help. Instead, it is a program which talks about taking from those who receive Family Allowances, those who receive old age pensions, those who are entitled to Government pensions because they paid for their pensions in the years they worked for the Government. It talks about those people making sacrifice. That, Mr. Speaker, is not a just society, which is why the Liberal Government is losing more and more credibility across Canada.