

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not find that that is really a point of order either. I find that that is debate, and if the Hon. Member wishes to rise on debate, that is fine. The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) has the floor.

[Translation]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blais) has just clearly demonstrated parliamentary hypocrisy. My friend, the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) was right: he was not here, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to continue my remarks. I was dealing—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, let me say that I do not think we should reflect on whether a person was in the Chamber or was not in the Chamber. There are television monitors outside in both lobbies and naturally Members of Parliament have the opportunity of viewing what is going on in the Chamber whether or not they are behind the curtain. That is beside the point. What I am saying now is that I do not want to have Hon. Members reflect on the attendance of persons whether in or out of the House.

Mr. Rossi: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am not reflecting on his attendance. It is the idea that he had to ask his colleague from Beauharnois whether he said it or not. That is different.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think we should get on with debate. Does the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have another point of order?

Mr. Blais: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Blais: It is another point of order, Mr. Speaker. He used again the word "hypocrisy" concerning another Hon. Member. I feel this expression is totally unacceptable and out of order.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will look at the "blues" tomorrow and if I find that unparliamentary language was used, I will rule accordingly.

[Translation]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I hope the minutes used by the Hon. Member will not be deducted from my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will resume my remarks—and you may rest assured that I am here to tell the truth. Even if this should displease my colleague from Bellechasse, I will continue telling the truth about his performance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compare the 1984 Throne Speech with the last one. What was the outcome for senior citizens? As I say, the Old Age Security pensions was de-indexed, discrimination was introduced in the spouse allowance

The Address—Mr. Malépart

regime and against those who are single, separated or divorced, and cuts were made in unemployment insurance benefits for early retirees. Suddenly, in the middle of the road, the Government has decided to make those unilateral cuts, without telling the people involved. Even Conservative Members often told people they were right. Mr. Speaker, those people were penalized. There were cuts in the New Horizons Program and the refusal of all home care projects for senior citizens. I appreciate the response of the Conservative Members who would rather have us refrain from telling the truth, and try to hide the fact that the people clearly were deceived in the 1984 speech. This is why people have reason to question the statements made by the Government, by the Prime Minister in the 1986 Throne Speech, considering the absence of any concrete proposals.

The same thing goes with respect to the family, and as I said, Canadian families were hit with the de-indexing of family allowances. Let us not forget that last year, Canadians lost \$55 million with the de-indexing of family allowances.

The House will recall that changes in the child tax credit have had a major impact on middle- and low-income families. The House will also recall that in the Budget, the Government decided to divide Canadian families into two categories. Families with an income of less than \$15,000 receive the child tax credit and will be entitled to an advance pre-payment, while families with an income of \$24,000 will be entitled to the full amount of the child tax credit but not to the advance pre-payment.

Mr. Speaker, considering that the Minister of State for Youth (Mr. Charest) is back in the House, that there was nothing in the 1984 Speech from the Throne and that nothing has been done for youth and that in 1986, once again, all we have is words, words, words—

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister of State for Youth took back what he said. However, if the Minister means that the Canadian Press reporter misled the people of Canada, he may have to suffer the consequences, because I am going to meet the reporter to tell her what the Minister of State for Youth said about his statement that it was high time youth got interested in something else besides peace, disarmament and the environment, which might well become a ghetto for them, as he said.

Mr. Speaker, of course the Minister of State for Youth was surprised a while ago when he heard that on unemployment statistics, Canada rated eighth among the OECD countries, while he was trying to prove that Canada was not last. If that is all he is going to do—

Mr. Speaker, we were able to hear the speech of the Hon. Minister of State for Youth, but there was absolutely no announcement in his speech that he would be cutting the official ribbon as his predecessor used to do.