

*Restraint of Government Expenditures*

with the best possible administration, so that families, individuals and business may survive, to make sure that our people as a whole enjoy a decent standard of living and to preserve everyone of our individual and collective rights.

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-19 which is now before us, is an omnibus bill.

• (2100)

We have seen omnibus bills introduced before in the House, bills which put the members in an excessively difficult situation. Indeed, we are in favour of some part of the bill, but we are at the same time opposed to another part of it. And when we want to accept what is good in the bill, we are forced to accept what is bad also, and when we refuse to take it all, we are accused of being opposed to what is good. This is a most unfortunate situation, but we have to make do with what we have. With this bill, it is proposed to change the Chapter 14 of the Adult Occupational Training Act, 1972. Secondly, it is proposed to change the Chapter 44 of the Family Allowance Act, 1973, to change the Industrial Research and Development Incentive Act, to abolish Information Canada, and to change the Western Grain Stabilization Act, all this in the very same bill. We could easily agree with some of the provisions in the bill and disagree with others. However I feel this is done deliberately. And I regret once more, Mr. Speaker, that the government still tries unfortunately to generate confusion with omnibus bills. However, it seems to me that with the army of civil servants and advisers working for the government, it could proceed as expeditiously and less confusedly. There is always too much confusion. We particularly need clear and precise legislation because it is the public that has to cope with the legislation we pass in the House, and if we want the people to cooperate with the administration, we must first of all give them precise and intelligent legislation so that the public can accept, in the proper time and place, less beneficial legislation, and under other circumstances, beneficial conditions.

Mr. Speaker, on November 5, I had the honour to introduce in the House and to propose Bill C-206 which is at second reading and which, I hope, will be referred in the House at the proper time for debate. I consider that this bill contains provisions which should be discussed more fully in the House, in committee and at the report stage so that situations which precisely compel the government to introduce Bill C-19 in order to restrain government spending be corrected. During the debate on second reading of Bill C-206, one member said: the member for Bellechasse did not spend much time preparing his bill because it is not thick. Mr. Speaker I always beware of thick bills, of bills which are really confused, which compress too many things at the same time.

I would rather have fewer pages and know what they contain because I understand what the Canadian people are likely to understand. That would really be interesting and would prove to the people of our country that we really mean well, that we want to take concrete measures that are easy to

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

understand. The population must be able to use laws in the same sensible way we use to develop and pass them.

Bill C-19 is intitled an act to amend or repeal certain statutes to enable restraint of government expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, it is terrible. It reminds me of the banker who gives an umbrella when the sun shines, but when it rains, he takes it away. The government offers us some programs when private enterprise is ready to provide jobs; when the economic activity is in full swing, the government has programs. It is precisely when the economic activity slows down, when private enterprise is no more able to absorb the available labour, that we need government intervention to counter-balance the lack of jobs. It is then that the umbrella is taken away by the government, that it deprives us of the benefit of certain laws, such as the family allowances act and that providing for a job-creation program which is commonly called LIP. Mr. Speaker, I think that the provision of the bill designed to save money at the expense of families is bad for Canada, because Canada is made up of families, and we have to make sure that our legislation always protects the rights of families, and even more so. And when families will be in good economic health we will have a country in good economic health.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to be surprised that young couples today refuse or nearly refuse the arrival of a newborn in their homes. But why? Is it because they are worse than the generation which preceded them? Not at all! It is because they must suffer overly difficult economic conditions that we now see a decrease in the birth rate in Canada and more particularly in my province of Quebec of which I am proud indeed. I have difficulty realizing that Providence gave us so much, so many resources of all kinds and that we should administer in a way that creates concern among the young and that they should not want to accept the continued existence of our people in a normal way. We must reflect on that and think about it twice.

Yet I had a bit of hope when on October 12 in the Speech from the Throne one could read—we are not told the year but simply:

On January 1 family allowances will again be indexed to the increase in the cost of living in 1976. I am prepared to take it that they meant January 1, 1977, but until then there will still be a period of twelve months in between. Until then I think the families of this country will be deprived of a necessary income, an important income that would have helped put economic blood in our system. When families have supplementary incomes in general they spend those incomes on necessities of life, and when those families buy more milk, more clothes, more necessities of life they help directly to dispose of production. And when production is disposed of, industries operate at fuller capacity and automatically families help create employment, reduce unemployment and circulate in our society the economic blood of the nation—money.

Mr. Speaker, I am offended that in 1976 a bill should be introduced to reduce the increase in family allowances that had been provided for in 1975.