

danger in each province making its own sales as this has a tendency to further balkanize our country. Also, the buyers have an opportunity to barter between the provinces. An effective federal policy could prevent this.

Canada has witnessed the recent development of the European Common Market and its benefits to the people who make up its membership. Do we in Canada lack the intelligence, the ability or the desire to stay away from the development of a European Canada? I do not have to remind the House that the former situation in Europe created two world wars in a lifetime. Canada needs an agency to pull the provinces together, rather than to further separate them. The federal government is the only agency available to us to accomplish this end.

Could we not take a leaf from the book of Europe? Can we not understand that those people have now agreed to work together in a larger community within the European Common Market? Here we have countries which have warred against each other but now, for the common good and in the interest of strength, have overcome a great number of their differences and are willing to work together. They have faced almost insurmountable barriers, but they have succeeded in mastering them.

When we compare this achievement in Europe to what Canada is experiencing today, we find that we do not have comparable obstacles to master. Let me stress that if the present, indifferent, lackadaisical attitude of this government is allowed to continue, Canada will become separated to such an extent that we will require much more than a common market to bring us back together as a nation.

I have never been an advocate of centralized power, because I believe that the further controls stray from the so-called grassroots, the more expensive becomes the administration. There is a certain segment of our governing process which must be administered at the local level, but there are areas of development and promotion which have to be performed on a national basis. This does not necessarily mean that the provinces or provincial organizations be weakened: the opposite would result, through a firmer national economic understanding.

In 1970, Canada imported more food than she exported. Mr. Speaker, in a country as agriculturally-oriented as Canada, with such tremendous potential, with our great ability to produce, this is a national disgrace and is reprehensible to all of us. Nothing will destroy a family, a province or a nation as rapidly as circumstances which cause one's grocery bill to be higher than one's pay cheque. Who is to blame? None other than the head of the family—which in this case, Mr. Speaker, is the government of Canada.

My constituency, as is the case in most others, is experiencing an increase in urban population. If we are to

reach our maximum growth, the value of intermediate and small towns must be recognized. Red Deer constituency is made up of a city and many towns which have a great deal to offer society if the federal government provides encouragement and opportunity. One cannot blame small businessmen if they do not establish within our area when assistance by grants is available at the other end of our province. The time has come for this policy to change, and definite action to be taken.

Talk and promises are not enough. There is no "if" or "but" about this; it is a must. Every small business and secondary industry should have the opportunity to expand and to settle within a province with assurance of equal benefits. The federal government spends such a large percentage of the tax dollar, as evidenced in this budget, that there is not enough left for municipal governments to develop as they can and as they wish. The federal government must either take less of the tax dollar, at the same time curbing its own administration costs, or it must give equal assistance to develop new areas and to re-establish those with potential in the smaller communities. Size really does not matter; there are certain parts of every community which need to be rebuilt and expanded.

The federal government would seem to be the worst offender when one looks at the cause of inflation and notes that the budget does not cut back on the cost of government itself. An example of this is the unprecedented cost of the staff of the Prime Minister's office—\$1 million in one year.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time of adjournment has now been reached.

**Mr. Lefebvre:** Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member requires only a minute or two to complete his remarks. Perhaps he might have the unanimous consent of the House to conclude.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Is the House agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Towers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If my constituency could have the privilege of using just half of that amount, many new industries could be established. Small businesses could expand with that \$500,000. The budget is not doing anything to give assistance where it is needed, to our small businesses and to secondary industries.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. It being five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at two o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 5.06 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.