

Restraint of Government Expenditures

do you have any experience? Miss, do you have any experience? One must be naive, Mr. Speaker, to ask that question to a student who tells you: I have just completed my studies. I have a diploma, I did my best, so I am available now on the labour market. And then, he is asked stupidly: Do you have any experience? It is simply killing. They do not understand anything! That is the kind of reasoning. If we really want to develop our labour, our youth for the benefit of this country, let us start by giving them a chance. Let us start by opening them some doors, and then we will see whether they are likely to acquire some ability. They will probably do, and we will then have an opportunity to use our human resources for the benefit of the development and advance of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that a government prefers to hand out unemployment benefits which are often more costly than wages paid in local industries, that they agree to support strong young people through welfare, whereas we spend half a million a day, or if we spend \$1 billion a year to pay for benefits, for allowances to people who do nothing, why should we not be clever enough to take the risk of paying the same amount and enable these people to use their intelligence, their skills, the diplomas they have received? It seems to me this would be appropriate in difficult situations.

I, for one, do not always blame private enterprise, Mr. Speaker, because according to available data, the private sector provides 60 per cent of all jobs in Canada. But because of the various pressures it is subject to, this sector ends up being less effective, and this is why the number of unemployed increases, even though some governments boast that they have created 100,000 or 200,000 new jobs this year. This is not what is important, Mr. Speaker. We must consider each year how many healthy people are really at work and productive. This is why I am not very pleased with the provisions of this bill, if we have to impose restraints of this kind under the pretence of saving some money.

We have something tremendous to build in Canada. We have lakes, the St. Lawrence River, the oceans. God has been good to us. We could very well have our own merchant marine. But to build that, we need human resources. We have men, qualified solderers, mechanics, why not put them to work building a merchant marine for our country? It seems to me quite logical.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to act like a demagogue and accuse governments of all the sins of Israel. Not at all, but let us make it quite clear that basically, the actual problem is a dollar problem, a money problem. And if we are aware of this money problem, aware that our financing system up to now has not adequately satisfied our country's needs, let us be honest and reform it. Let us take a chance, things could not be worse than they are now, because, Mr. Speaker, this government, the government of Canada, under the pretext of helping the provinces, I explained it on November 5, under the pretence of helping Quebec build low rental housing for retired people, they are claiming a 17 per cent interest rate. When a government has to pay 17 per cent interest rate to build public utilities, how could private enterprise survive with a competitor

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

like that? It is in that direction, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to direct our research.

We shall find out things pretty quickly. All we have to do is follow the indications of the Auditor General of Canada, and listen to the well informed opinions of some free economists, I do not mean economists who allowed themselves to be bought out, who are working for loan sharks, I mean really free thinking economists, objective economists who are able to view the economic situation in its real context and provide public administrations with means to make our economic system and all our activities more efficient, so that we stop talking nonsense, wasting away our energies to try to put bandaids on a wooden leg.

There was an old beggar in my parish who had a wooden leg. Even if he had put bandaids on it every day, it would still have been a wooden leg. The same goes for us. If we put bandaids on this and that, on things, means, systems that give no results, what do we achieve? Let us change method.

That is what I am suggesting to the government, this evening, on the occasion of the debate on Bill C-19. Mr. Speaker, you who are listening to me, for the love of God ask His Honour the Speaker of the House to bring back to Parliament Bill C-206 as soon as possible that we might continue to study it in depth, in order to find some solution or other that would enable the government to give administrative results of which the people can be proud. I could not care less what party does it; whether it be the Conservatives who perform the reform, I would rejoice, whether it be the NDP, I would rejoice, and whether it be the Liberals, I would be happy; just as long as something positive, concrete is done. It is the results that count. It is the results that we want.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that we have here an intelligent assembly. In fact I know all my colleagues of the House quite well; I have always had considerable respect for each and everyone of them.

We can have different opinions but we must not disagree on the means to meet the objective. I worked a lot in the building industry and I happened to have foremen who had opinions which were different from mine on how to erect a scaffold, but the objective was not the scaffold, the idea was to be able to put the roofing and the last layers of bricks; this was the objective. If we are in Parliament, it is to build, no matter what materials we want to use; it is our objective that matters.

The objective, Mr. Speaker, is to give our country a sound administration, to give our young people, our children who are going to survive us, a heritage of which they will be proud and then they will say among themselves: do you know that these people were not that foolish; they did not have the education we have, they did not have the advantage to wear out as many seats in universities, but they used the little education they had to make something really positive and then they will say: it is not as bad as all that; we must do better.

And with this in mind, they will go on with renewed vigour instead of being discouraged as they are now because it is discouraging to see them act the way they do. I see it every