our debates these days are not particularly relevant to the economy at certain times. The hon. member should be commended for bringing us back to a crucial question which should be the focal point of our daily concerns.

Of course this bill features clauses or provisions with which I agree entirely and others on which I have certain reservations. I think the introductory sentence of the remarks of the hon. member for Bellechasse who quoted an excerpt from the Speech from the Throne was perfectly attuned to the measures he is proposing. The Speech from the Throne reminded us of the reality of the economic situation and told us that we should not be looking for the way to correct that situation in the conventional means. I also believe that indeed the hon. member's bill does not draw its proposed solutions from the conventional means of economic theories.

However, we are often told and often reminded in this House that the government has been and is still unduly involved in the direct conduct of economic affairs. The government is being blamed for its constant interventions in the economic mechanisms not only through fiscal measures but through many other government endeavours. More especially when discussing with small contractors and businessmen, they tell us that quite often a high percentage of their administration costs goes for filing forms coming from the municipal, provincial or federal governments.

Mr. Speaker, in that case I believe they are entirely right. When the bookkeeping section of a business which has about fifteen employees devotes 25 or 30 per cent of its time to deal with the Quebec Pension Board, the medical insurance scheme, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, the excise tax and all kinds of forms from the various governments, I think we have reached a saturation point as a result of the interventions made by various departments and governments.

Mr. Speaker, the first reservation I have about Bill C-205 is that it will add a new mechanism which at first sight seems to be really complex and sets really heavy restrictions on the various agencies of our economy. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note some points which I find highly interesting. In particular, we find this provision in subclause 5(h) at page 4 of the bill:

> Every Canadian citizen over 18 years of age shall be entitled to apply—

—under this bill—

> —for a basic security income of $100 per month—

● (1732)

The colleagues of the hon. member for Bellechasse and the hon. member himself have often emphasized the need for such a program. I would not want to misinterpret this clause of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Bellechasse, but I would interpret this as a form of guaranteed minimum income. In my opinion, the government should urgently implement such a program.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) made some comments on this issue recently, but I believe that the time for comments or proposals is passed and that we must now take some action. I know that several members on this side of the House share the interest of the Social Credit Party of Canada in a guaranteed minimum income program and I hope that my colleague will continue to urge the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the members of Cabinet to develop such a program as soon as possible.

What I like particularly about subclause 5(h), Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the hon. member has mentioned in his bill certain existing government programs, such as the Unemployment Insurance Program, which could help finance this plan. If we examine the expenditures of the government for the programs mentioned by the hon. member in subclause 5(h), I believe there would be enough money to finance a universal guaranteed minimum income which would assist all Canadian citizens equally. In my opinion, this provision of the bill is extremely interesting and we should consider it seriously.

I was also interested by something that the hon. member for Bellechasse said in his speech, for instance that an economic system must serve the people. I think that the hon. member often says that the people should not serve economic systems. I suggest that this is a basic truth that we should keep in mind all the time. I feel that he is right when he says that he does not believe our economic institutions and our present system are really and primarily geared to serve the public, for indeed they are geared to serve themselves. In other words, this system looks at itself in a mirror and tries to please itself and provide benefits to itself, instead of providing them to the citizens.

According to the hon. member for Bellechasse, serious-minded economists, not the kind who tries time and again to find solutions to cyclical and permanent problems, in other words economists who are not limited in their originality, should take the time to consider these proposals. I think it would warrant the trouble, and the proposals which could prove detrimental should be cast aside. I feel that there are many very interesting measures in this bill, and that we should seriously consider putting them to work to remedy our current situation.

Mr. Speaker, if we recognize that the situation is new and different, it is not by falling back on outdated economic measures, to quote from the Speech from the Throne, that we will be able to correct the situation, but rather through innovative measures, as stated in the Speech from the Throne. I believe that proposals put forward by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) are innovative measures, and as such they deserve to be considered.

Another reservation I would like to make, in addition to those expressed at the beginning of my speech, is the proposed reversal of the inflation of land values, as opposed to other property values. This in my view could create difficulties. It is proposed for instance that they should be brought back to the level of 10 years ago. In Neuville or Saint-Raymond or Pont-Rouge, in the riding of Portneuf—and I believe conditions are similar in the hon. member's riding—a farm costing $15,000, $16,000 or $18,000 ten years ago is now worth $100,000 or $150,000. So I do not believe it would be such a terrible help to the owners of such farms if their values were