

political expediency—the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) has used the phrase “pork-barrelling”—but in terms of service to the public of Canada, which must be a consideration, particularly in a time of restraint, that that kind of service could not be given in the relocated areas. And that is a criterion which naturally has to be applied not only with respect to the areas to which the government organizations are moving but also having to do with the over-all effectiveness of delivery of service to the public. This was the dilemma we faced, and we measured our decisions against those criteria.

With regard to decentralization projects which had been physically advanced to the point at which the commitment had been made to the extent that we could not back away with honesty as a government, we did not back away from them but we were placed in a dilemma as a government: we suspected there was some reason for which these should not go forward but we could not pinpoint the reason until we came to office. When we did, we had the benefit of the advice of the public service and, as a result, we made the decisions which had to be made.

I said to the Minister of Public Works that I would be dealing with another matter. I think there is a potential for real conflict in the national capital area with respect to its planning. One has to take a look at the official plan of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton which is the duly authorized planning authority for this area, and at the proposals for the development of the national capital. One sees that those plans meet head on. In the plan for the National Capital Commission there is concentration upon development in the core of Ottawa-Hull, the Ottawa River being a bridge between the two—I use the word “bridge” rather than the word “barrier”. That is the concentration of the federal plan, whereas the municipal plan—and under the act the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has pre-eminence in planning officially for the area—under the municipal plan there is a provision for the placing of government buildings, federal installations, within the national capital area in the area municipalities.

As the minister knows, I live in Nepean, and in that municipality there is provision as it affects that municipality. In the city of Kanata they would be delighted to augment what it has in terms of government installations. The official plan of the township of Goulburn—perhaps I should say the plan of the region as it affects Goulburn—provision is made and space set aside for the development of federal institutions. Take a look at the official plan as it affects the township of Osgoode. The same applies in the case of Rideau township.

I realize that buildings cannot be torn down and I understand that because of the investment involved public servants cannot be brought back, but I want the minister to take a look

### *Business of the House*

at this proposal. If there is to be relocation from time to time out of Ottawa where heretofore head offices were to be, into the national capital area as Bill C-13 contemplates, the Government of Canada should regard the national capital area not just with respect to Hull, however worthy its desire for expansion is, but regard the whole of the national capital area as worthy of consideration because it is important that there be a balanced development within the national capital region. I also think it is important with respect to public servants that there be consultation as to moves and that there should be consultation with local governments. Failing this, a conflict of development priorities is likely to arise which could do nothing but harm to the relationship between the federal government and local government.

May I call it six o'clock?

● (1800)

**Mr. Collenette:** Mr. Speaker, I might be a little off base here, but I understood that perhaps there was some disposition to seeing this bill passed. I am not sure whether my friend, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), had finished his remarks or whether there were other speakers. I understood that there were just two speakers from the official opposition, and if we could have the indulgence of the House for a couple of minutes the minister might want to reply before this bill goes to committee, if that is the agreement of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** This can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the parliamentary secretary would mind getting to his feet again and telling us the order for tomorrow.

**Mr. Collenette:** Mr. Speaker, we had hoped to have Bill C-13 disposed of today, but we plan to bring that tomorrow afternoon right after question period to finish it off, and then we will proceed with Bill C-22. Should we dispose of Bill C-22, then we will bring back Bill S-6.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.