

In this connection I should like to offer a suggestion. When we talk about make-work programs I suggest that in working out the details and in putting the plans and programs into place and establishing the goals for the development of their area, municipal authorities should be taken into careful consideration because I believe in this way something really worth while can be done. I am not saying that nothing was done under LIP or other programs, but I suggest that if the government worked in closer co-operation with municipal governments it would find it could move forward to the realization of those objectives that representatives on that level of government have been studying and trying to put in place. If the federal government will co-operate along that line, we will see something really worth while being done. There are plenty of opportunities for activities of this kind.

We can go back to the winter works program of some years ago. Very worth while work was done under this particular program, but while we find the government spending a great deal of money in other types of operations, we find that municipal governments are strapped for finances, and they are not able to carry through to the realization of their objectives.

● (2050)

I listened to a talk show just a few days ago, and a mayor was the guest on the show. He remarked that he would be very happy if he could provide the residents of his district with recreational facilities equal to those provided in one of the penal institutions by the penitentiary service. I suggest that spending money in providing facilities in communities would be much more beneficial and productive than spending money on so-called rehabilitative programs and facilities which have failed to achieve their objectives.

I am just pointing out in this connection that if these programs were operated in conjunction with programs at the municipal level, we would see the fulfillment of some of the dreams of the people in these communities, and there would be some facilities which would be for the benefit of all the people.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that this is not a bill to facilitate restraint of government expenditures. It only transfers to other programs amounts that are now being allocated to the old types of programs. My colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), pointed this out quite clearly in his intervention a few days ago when he talked about how much the government was proposing to save by cutting off the cost of living increase in a certain type of program. Then he pointed out that in all likelihood if the people were not able to qualify and fulfil their objective of being retrained for other types of work, they could conceivably fall out altogether and go on unemployment insurance or on welfare, and the money would be taken up and spent in that way.

We could go on with many other things, but in conclusion I would like to say that Canadians do not object to the introduction of programs designed to assist those who, through a variety of reasons, are unable to compete successfully at a highly competitive time. Canadians do not object to the financing of programs which contribute to the over-all de-

Restraint of Government Expenditures

velopment of our national economy. They do not object to being called upon to provide those services which we as individual citizens are unable to provide for ourselves. They do not object to providing assistance to underdeveloped countries, if that aid is carefully and effectively disbursed to alleviate human suffering. But Canadians do object to the squandering of their money in ways which undermine the will of some individuals to pull their share of the national load. They object to governments implying by their policies that the citizens are not intelligent enough to spend their own money, care for their own needs and discharge their own responsibilities, and that therefore government has to withdraw their money from their pockets and hand it out again in some other form.

Canadians object to being looked upon as an inexhaustible source of dollars to support governmental programs which have been growing wild ever since this government took office in 1968, and the benefits from those programs have been extremely limited.

My colleague, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), this afternoon laid out special priorities which are essential in his area of the country, and when we talk about curtailing expenditures, immediately the government raises the cry: "What do you want to cut out?" It is not exactly a matter of cutting out; it is a matter of setting priorities in a way which will enable people to understand what is being done and in a way which will prove to the people that something worth while is being accomplished, and the government should be sincere in its desire and in its effort to pull the economy out of the doldrums and lead the nation on a path of progress and development.

I am not hopeful at all that this government is able to do that, but I believe that when the next election rolls around, the people will effect a change—a change which is indicated very strongly in the polls across the country today—and I believe that the government which will be installed under the leadership of our leader, the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), will be able to set in place the type of program which will get the country on the road again to development and progress, and which will enable this nation to reach some of the objectives which incorporate the aspirations of its people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, as I am rising to take part in this debate, the voting is over in the Province of Quebec and the TV networks are broadcasting the results of the election. This is probably the reason why I am the only French speaking member from my province to be in this House at this time. In any event, it is evident that the whole of Canada is watching most attentively the development of this political campaign which is a source of enormous interest and understandably so.

However, Mr. Speaker, we, the hon. members present in the House of Commons, have responsibilities which are particular to us, and I for one intend to assume them and do my best, in co-operation with other hon. members, to provide our country