

Restraint of Government Expenditures

nothing else. They wish trains were simply eliminated, while they could go on filling the offices in large hotels and Montreal station centers. But we, in the Saguenay Lac Saint-Jean area, need that mode. We are entitled to it, because we also contribute to the 91 million deficit or more incurred each year by the CN.

It seems to me the logical thing to do would be to keep our stations open, at least when trains pass by. I put a question to the minister in that regard, and I want him to take his time—he told me he would answer the next day or the day after and I am still waiting for an answer—I want him to take his time to consider that aspect of the service. Because as I stated in this House, our area is sending an S.O.S. signal. The minister promised to consider that. I ask him not only to study the proposition but to put an end to those ridiculous orders in my constituency. I sometimes wonder if the big bosses in CN have any common sense left at all. Today every station is closed, and if nobody does anything about it, tomorrow the train won't even stop. The conductor will shout to passengers: Jump out, we don't stop here! Is that CN's new rapid train policy? If there are reductions to be made, I would simply ask the minister to make them at the top so he can increase the number of operations people. I hope that this time someone will listen to what I am saying.

I would like to come back now to another clause of Bill C-19, or I should say to four other clauses since the government needs four clauses to put a freeze on family allowances. My colleague, the hon. member from Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), who has voiced so strongly his opposition to the government's decision not to index family allowances, has proved conclusively the lack of logic of such a measure. When he introduced in the House a bill to freeze family allowances, the minister knew very well that we would have voted against such a measure if the relevant clauses had been presented as a separate bill but instead he chose to include them in Bill C-19. That is why he introduced his omnibus bill, to induce us to commit ourselves. Indeed, if we reject the bill, it would mean that we have voted against the restraint of government expenditures and that we are in favour of increased expenses, and if we vote in favour of the bill, we will have to accept the clauses that we are rejecting. Consequently we ask the government to be honest and to divide this bill so that we can reject what is wrong and accept what is acceptable. Sure, if the government proposed to reduce some unnecessary or excessive expenses such as the trips that the Prime Minister or the other ministers make on government expenses, we would be particularly willing to vote for the bill but we cannot support the government when it proposes to reduce the revenues of the families which are already too disadvantaged in our society and especially in the area which I represent. Our unemployment rate is the highest and we simply cannot accept the fact that the family allowances are not linked to the increase in the cost of living. The government should have thought long ago to reduce the expenditures of its bureaucracy because they are increasing day after day.

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

It should stop squeezing low income families! As there are very few tax exemptions, middle income families are taxed on what they need to live. This bill goes even further because there will be a ceiling on family allowances, which will especially affect those who cannot afford to pay taxes. These allowances would have helped them offset the constant increase in the cost of food. I claim that this is an anti-family and anti-social bill. This is why I cannot accept that some clauses of this omnibus bill and I sincerely hope that, in committee, these clauses will be deleted and that each clause will be clearly explained so that we can vote on each one of them afterwards in order to adopt or reject the bill in the House.

● (1740)

[English]

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-19 is a small bill, a small package with scurrilous intent like many other small bills which are periodically slipped in for observation and comment.

Nevertheless, I am pleased, indeed relieved, to see that finally the bill will put to sleep the Company of Young Canadians. I wonder what has become of the directors of this project, the firebrand friends of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I was present, along with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), at a meeting of the standing committee last year when the CYC appeared before us. It was I who asked its officials to provide us with an annual report, to give us some account of their activities, perhaps a first-hand account. I did have the opportunity of hearing a first-hand account of at least part of their activities. I recall a discussion with a Catholic priest in a small community which had received an extended visit from representatives of the CYC. They caused such division within that small community as to create a total social upheaval, a total loss of respect for the elders of that neighbourhood. What they were injecting was nothing more than socialist dogma.

I share the disgust of the hon. member for Provencher that the annual report which was provided by the CYC a few days ago is for the year 1974. The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) said the CYC was designed to be a trouble-making institution. Well, this is one Liberal program which would naturally have the support and admiration of the NDP. At any rate, today we see the beginning of the demise of the CYC and also the demise of "misinformation Canada". As a bookstore it was probably a success if they could have avoided double-ticketing. It also had a habit of introducing multi-million dollar programs which were half-advanced, half-drafted, poorly conceived and repeatedly rejected by the minister responsible—there is another "half" I am constrained not to mention. This agency, a child wandering in the wilderness of the bureaucracy with a paucity of thought, is well interred. Rest in peace!

The other day, the hon. member from Fort William (Mr. McRae), to whom I listened with some interest, attempted, unsuccessfully, to rationalize for his Prime Minister (Mr.