

this afternoon, certainly it is because I suppose they consulted people, and I do not question whether this was done in good faith. Let us recognize we had time to consult. If consultation means that we have to listen to everything that people want to say about the matter, no responsible Government can do such a thing. We listen, we assess the advantages and the disadvantages and we make decisions in accordance with the policy or the direction which the Government has chosen. I do not think that there was a lack of consultation. The direction taken is not that suggested by some people and I fully agree but some consultations were held, we listened and we assessed the advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government must operate along the same lines as a business or an undertaking, that is on the basis of figures, results and directions, taking into consideration the capacity of the citizen to pay and especially the capacity of our children to pay.

When I was mayor of the City of Beauharnois, I used to say to my people: "I must try to build a city for my children, not for myself, for my children. I want them to stay there." I think this is what the Government is doing by putting an end to that measure which is the largest question-mark in the management of our national finances. If we want to build a country for our children, we have to be wise and acknowledge that this indexation is no longer possible.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for that motion not because I am in favour of reductions, but because I think that we have to stick with our present orientations.

In 1979, my hon. friend who spoke earlier was in this House when indexation was removed. The amount of pensions and family allowances would now be \$20 higher each month if indexation had been maintained. I have the speech made by the Hon. Minister at the time, in 1979, and you acted cautiously. You said at one time: We have to put a stop to this automatic increase. In my opinion, it was important to do so. Otherwise, family allowances would now be \$20 more a month. Do you really believe that the Canadian people could afford that? You stopped indexation because of that. The issue was quite real at the time. No Minister of Finance ever managed financial affairs of the Government that way.

Mr. Speaker, as this is a motion moved by the Liberal Party, it is very important for the other side to take a positive part in this debate, and I am happy to see that all the Liberal Members are here to defend their motion. Do not leave, everyone; one is staying. All the Members are here to defend the Liberal motion and that is very important.

You know, there is a lot of exaggeration. People have said that the Government has spent \$55 million to change the colour of Army uniforms, but is not willing to give the same amount to mothers. I would like to point out that there are mothers working in the worsted and cotton industries, that a \$7 million contract was awarded in Huntingdon to produce the new colour material for the Army uniforms, and that these \$7

million are important for the men and women who work in these industries in Huntingdon.

It is not 94 cents a month per child which will change anything, but the colours of Army uniforms have changed, even though a lot of uniforms remained exactly the same. In any case, they would have had to be changed within two years. A comparison is being drawn between two completely different matters. We can give a different orientation to our social policy, but we can also keep a commitment which is to provide uniforms for our military. A comparison is being made between two things which have nothing in common. People do not necessarily forget when they move from one side of the House to another, but they have to make their decisions accordingly. There have been consultations and I believe that the Government should be managed in a businesslike way.

**Mr. Rossi:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) on a point of order.

**Mr. Rossi:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted the record to show that my hon. friend for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Hudon), for whom I have a lot of respect, said: "Do not go away, everyone!" However, I was called to the phone at the back, Mr. Speaker, and I did not leave because I did not want to listen to his excellent speech. I was simply called away and no Liberal Member left the House because he was speaking. His speech was—

---

● (1630)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 46, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Young Offenders Act—Request for amending legislation; the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria)—The Administration—(a) Request for review of contract awards. (b) Conflict of interest guidelines; the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Cultural Affairs—(a) Canada-United States talks—Government policy. (b) Time magazine—Possible re-emergence of Canadian edition.