

The costs of that move are immense and totally unnecessary with respect to the viability of the nuclear industry in Canada. There is a great deal of money and room that would be available there.

The whole decentralization program of the government impacts heavily upon the constituency of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, the parliamentary secretary who has just spoken. Billions of dollars will be involved over a period of years in relocation grants and a whole host of other things. If it were abandoned, those funds would be available. Also there is moving Parks Canada from Cornwall to Peterborough. In order to be direct with the House, I have to say that it is becoming more obvious every day—not just to us on this side of the House, but more important, to people outside the House—that perhaps that is one of the least advisable and most questionable decisions the government has made against its employees' wishes and, most important, against good sense.

It does not take into account the \$500 million additional load. It does not take into account the incentive and encouragement that could be given for growth in the voluntary sector, a great incentive for those engines, those people who want to help. The tremendous growth that would take place would lessen the load of government and the necessity of government applying its taxpayers' money and its own efforts with respect to services that must be performed within a country that is changing so quickly that sometimes it is alarming to many people.

I am delighted the member brought forth the motion. I am delighted to support it, but I am disappointed that the response was not just a bit more positive. I believe the day has come for the idea he put forward. I will have occasion on another day to argue a motion along the same lines. It is motion No. 53 standing in my name. For the purposes of indicating that there is a great interest in this area, I should like to quote my motion, as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act to change the automatic deduction of \$100 for medical expenses and charitable donations, to an automatic deduction of \$100 for medical expenses, with all charitable donations being deductible from the total income on which tax payable is calculated.

The fact that there are two motions is important. We are very fortunate to have this particular motion debated today. There is a growing interest in the House and in the country in the support, the development and the use of the voluntary sector in Canada.

As Mr. Speaker will recall, because he was a member of the House in the Thirty-first Parliament, we brought forward a motion to establish a select committee of the House of Commons to study and review the place of and help for the voluntary sector. We asked ourselves as a Parliament to have those people come in and tell us their needs, where they fit in the scheme of things, and to encourage the government of that day, and indeed successive governments, that this kind of contribution was necessary. Arising out of this debate I hope there will be at some stage a speaker who will indicate to the House that this still remains a prerogative of government which is considered important, to give a reference to the House

Charitable Donations

of Commons, if it cannot grant this motion, to advance the cause of volunteerism and contribution of the voluntary sector, because it is so important.

● (1740)

All governments must govern, and government parties and those with the hope of forming governments are all talking about restraining growth and expenditures in the public sector. That is reasonable, in my judgment, and should be done, but it leaves the men and women in those communities out there who require a level of service, particularly as those communities become more urbanized and as those factors that make up the communities change, with that need for service. There is a golden opportunity, as that void will inevitably be created by restraint and withdrawal of public service, for an infusion of service from the private sector. It is the voluntary sector, the men and women of good will, who band together to help their fellow men and women who fill that vacuum and provide that service.

Governments cannot be everywhere. As there are differences when we move from one region of the country to another, as we move from the city to the rural area, as we move among groups of young people and senior citizens, and as we tackle more things, or feel we should tackle more in terms of social problems, there is a requirement for a diversity of service. Governments which are monolithic to a great degree, whether provincial, federal or municipal, cannot attack every problem in a way that might meet particular needs.

The interesting thing about the voluntary sector is that it is made up of special interest groups who tackle specific problems within specific communities. As a result there is a flexibility that contrasts with the relatively necessary inflexibility of government. It is worth while supporting the motion and the idea behind the motion in order that society can be even better served.

I do not intend to speak very long because the case was admirably put. I think there was general sympathy for the idea on the part of the spokesman for the government, but I wish some member of that government party over there would raise in their caucus the importance of the continuance of the initiative for a study at least by this Parliament of the voluntary sector, its needs, and its place in the community. If that could be done I would applaud the government. I would applaud the government if it continued with that initiative. If there is some member over there who would pledge that he will raise that with the government of the day, then I think the voluntary sector would be grateful. We would be embarking on a course of action to serve a segment of the community which has not been served in quite the same way as the needs of today require it to be served. It is in that spirit that I support my colleague and commend him for bringing forth this motion today on such an important subject.

Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), I am disappointed that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Mr.