

civil service moved to the greater Moncton area and then into the Bathurst area. I think this is good. Not only should the government go to Atlantic Canada but also I agree with some of the previous speakers who suggested that some of these offices and departments should be moved to western Canada.

● (2150)

I am certainly convinced that the offices which are being decentralized can work very efficiently for the Canadian public in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, in Nova Scotia, in Newfoundland or indeed on the west coast, just as they can here in the nation's capital, Ottawa. I understand the concern of the local people. Naturally there would be concern by the mayor and the people in the area about space being left vacant because of the movement of the people. I understand this and am most sympathetic about it. No one wants to be moved or disturbed, but of course there must be some understanding and realization of the situation. There are the realities of the thing.

The government has not said it intends to move all the departments from Ottawa. However, when the media and others become involved it sometimes seems as if the government is moving toward decentralization of all agencies, Crown corporations, and departments to some other part of Canada. This is not true.

There has been a well considered plan in respect of the movement of some branches and departments to other sectors of Canada. Why not? As I mentioned in respect of fuel, Canadians in eastern Canada are entitled to enjoy the benefit of the natural resources in Alberta, just as the people of Alberta, British Columbia or Manitoba would want to enjoy the natural resources we have in Atlantic Canada. We share these things. It is a two-way street, and should be. This is the way it should be if we are to have a good strong country.

Notwithstanding the results, I was surprised that throughout the election campaign which was conducted in the province of Quebec we did not hear much reference to the federal money that has gone to that province, and to the specialized programs such as DREE and so on through which the federal government assists the provincial government. Depending on the final result we will have to take a serious look at all these projects and the way in which they affect all the provinces and the territories.

To use an expression used by members of the opposition, it seems passing strange that it is very convenient to talk all around something and not tell the truth about the actual programs that are being implemented and the number of dollars that go into the provincial programs from federal funds.

It certainly can be said in respect of my province that the Conservative administration in New Brunswick has not said one word about the 50 per cent of the budget that comes into the province is federal money and DREE money. The administration conveniently forgets to mention the number of federal dollars involved in provincial programs.

Business of the House

I want to conclude my remarks by re-stating that I support Bill C-19 just as I support all the other comprehensive federal government programs that are being administered today.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to correct the record in respect of statements made by the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) and the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau). The hon. member for Restigouche used the phrase "tell the truth". It is encouraging to hear one member on that side of the House use such phrases. Now all we have to do is impress on members opposite that they must understand the meaning of such phrases so that Canada and Canadians will have an opportunity to enjoy the benefits which should be ours as a result of an intelligent government. This government has just become a leaky utensil which can no longer hold water. It plugs a hole here, and then the water runs out somewhere else. This is what has happened.

This afternoon the hon. member for Gloucester said that the government had to have increased revenue. I should like to refer to the increased revenue that has fallen into the lap of the government. In 1969 from all forms of tax, municipal, provincial and federal, the Canadian people paid \$24,914,000,000. In 1974, five years later, this figure had almost doubled to \$48,461,000,000. The question we as legislators have to decide is how this money will be spent. This is a very important issue. Perhaps the government does not understand how this money should be spent.

There are many ways in which money can be wasted. The vessel is leaking so badly it can no longer hold water and it is therefore spewing out all over the place. We must realize that this government probably is one of the most wasteful governments Canada has ever had trying to govern this country. Every member on that side of the House is living a lie because of the fact that he was elected by misrepresentation, both in respect of the issues and otherwise, because of the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated time and time again that he was opposed to controls in Canada and then, a few months after the election, the government brought them in.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask someone on the government side what the business will be for tomorrow and possibly for the balance of the week if the Prime Minister does not plan to issue a writ and go to the people after the results of this evening in Quebec? Is there someone over there who can tell us the business of the House?

Mr. McRae: Mr. Speaker, I understand that tomorrow we will continue with the discussion of the bill we have had before us today.