

Restraint of Government Expenditures

places like Courtenay, Campbell River and Nanaimo, where they could do the job equally as well with their tie-in computers and telephone lines. It does not cost any more to send a letter to a small community than to the city of Vancouver.

In my area this winter unemployment is going to reach 15 per cent of the population. Putting one or two government departments in my constituency would significantly cut down that rate and provide jobs for the area.

The leader of the NDP would transfer massive amounts of federal money to given areas of low unemployment, such as Vancouver. Moving these departments into areas of high unemployment would result in lower building costs and would stimulate the economies of small communities that will be in the doldrums this winter. There would also be a federal presence and people would say, "Yes, I guess we do have a federal government".

Speaking only of western Canada now, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to put mints in provincial capitals, if we continue to put search and rescue into Vancouver and Vancouver alone, the decentralization program of this government or of any other government is not going to be worth the powder to blow it to hell. All you are doing, Mr. Speaker, is sending departments into other large areas that did not need further growth in the first place. People will say, "The bureaucracy has done it again. It has taken departments out of the greater Ottawa area and put them into the greater Vancouver area, the greater Calgary area and the greater Edmonton area, which does not benefit any of these communities". In this way we have shown we are not intelligent enough to formulate a policy that puts priority on moving federal departments into areas of high unemployment, and thus solving some, at least, of the unemployment problem.

What are we saying to the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps we are saying to them this: "Look, you guys, you might as well get out of Newfoundland and vacate the bloody place—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order.

Mr. Anderson:—because you aren't going to get any money there anyway; move to Edmonton or Calgary because you guys will always be sitting at the backside of the cow". Is this what we are trying to say to these people, Mr. Speaker? I hope not.

I would ask my hon. friends in the official opposition to make a few comments on what they want to see happen in Canada. Either they do not know or they will not tell us. They are entirely mute on the subject, except for the hon. member who represents an area of Ottawa who asks whether a few office buildings are going to be left vacant. I do not care if there are 10 office buildings vacant in the city of Ottawa; I say get government departments into other parts of Canada. I guarantee that the city of Ottawa will continue to thrive and grow whether we move some departments out or not.

Since we are talking about government expenditure, what can we do as a government to make sure that money is shared equally among the people of Canada but that areas that need

[Mr. Anderson.]

help are given some assurance that we are at least aware of their problem? Let us not talk about saving \$1.5 million when we can put this money into, say, fisheries in Newfoundland, I will not say in St. John's because there are better places in other parts of Newfoundland. Let us spend money in some of the outlying areas of Newfoundland and British Columbia, instead of crowding into centres and accentuating our urban problems. Is that planning? No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think so.

I hope that out of our discussions on Bill C-19 we will arrive at a more rational way of making sure that the money we spend as a government, whether it be \$42 billion, \$39 billion or \$36 billion, is spent wisely and in the best interests not only of larger centres but of the small communities that I consider are the backbone of Canada. Unless we start helping them pretty soon, Mr. Speaker, we will not have to worry about these areas much longer because no one will be living in them.

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of listening to spokesmen for the government side and I can appreciate the fact that they have been pleading with members of the official opposition to come forward with some answers to the problems facing Canada today. We have all realized for quite a long time that the Liberal party is completely bankrupt of ideas, and the results of their programs throughout the nation have caused their popularity to nosedive so far as public opinion polls are concerned. I think this is an indication of the Liberal party's frustration and anger, and they are now trying to turn the tables on the official opposition by saying we are not helping them out or telling them what to do, and this is why they are stumbling around.

With all due respect to my colleague from British Columbia, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson), we do sympathize with him. We know he is labouring under severe handicaps. The Liberal party has followed the same course it followed previously. The Progressive Conservative party would propose programs, and in desperation the Liberals would pick them up, put them into operation and get something done.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Patterson: It was reported a short time ago that a meeting of Liberals was held to try to figure out why their showing in the public opinion polls had indeed taken a nosedive over the past few months. It seems to me that that is a completely unnecessary exercise, Mr. Speaker. If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet ministers do not know what the problem is, then all they have to do is mingle with the grassroots Liberals, or the former grassroots Liberals, and they would certainly tell them what was what. They are not hesitant about telling us, and I am sure they would be quite willing to pass the information along to the government in an attempt to try to rectify the situation we find ourselves in today.

● (2030)

In reviewing my correspondence from my constituents I am reminded that one of the main criticisms of the Trudeau