

very difficult to follow. He speaks better than he sings, and he sings quite well.

I agree with the hon. member for Shefford—

[English]

—he does not know Karl Marx from Groucho Marx.

[Translation]

Mr. Rondeau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Shefford raises a point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a correction to today's official report and tell hon. members of this House that the more I study Karl Marx, and I have all his books in my library, the more I tend to move away from his ideology.

[English]

Mr. Leggatt: The hon. member has obviously moved to another planet.

I rise basically to talk about the madness in this bill. There was a time when we looked at this, and someone suggested that we could regionalize the country into provinces. As I remember, it was a Tory motion at one point in this House which suggested that we could change the period of entitlement in a variety of regions based upon provincial boundaries. The only thing more stupid I could imagine could be to separate the country into 54 separate regions. We are now going to divide the country into 54 little districts.

Mr. Peters: Call it seats in the Senate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is more than the number of states in the United States.

Mr. Leggatt: Nova Scotia has a 13.2 per cent unemployment rate. This bill would give the poor person in Nova Scotia who cannot find a job 42 weeks of benefits if he can put in 10 weeks of work. In the lower mainland of British Columbia where there is an 8.5 per cent rate, 10 weeks of work will give an individual nothing in terms of unemployment insurance benefits. It is just as tough to be poor in Vancouver as it is in Cape Breton, and the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) would be the first to agree with that.

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

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Debate

URBAN AFFAIRS—ALLEGATION GOVERNMENT OWES TAXES TO MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, since Confederation, Ottawa, as the capital of Canada, has been a focal point for the dreams of this country. Today the national capital region faces many problems and is being viewed by the rest of the country not as a symbol of the dreams of Canada but as a reflection of our insensitive and uncaring government.

There have been significant changes in the national capital region in recent years. Until the 1960's the federal government was virtually unopposed in the planning process in the capital area. With the growth of regional government in Ontario and Quebec in the 1970's, the federal government's massive relocation to Hull, and the growth of the city of Ottawa and the suburban townships, has come the need for a fresh approach by the government to the national capital region.

Unilateral planning in isolation is no longer appropriate for the senior government in the capital of Canada. Action taken by the federal government without discussions with provincial and municipal governments must be replaced by consultation among the planning partners.

Recently a special joint committee on the national capital region met to hear testimony about the structure and the future of our area. There is a strong need for co-ordinated planning in this area and for a forum where problems and goals can be discussed. I believe that the special joint committee should be reconstituted as a standing committee of the House of Commons with responsibility for planning and developing the national capital region. This standing committee should also be responsible for the operation of the National Capital Commission and help co-ordinate the affairs of government departments which operate in splendid isolation in this city: Public Works, Urban Affairs, and the Department of Agriculture, to name just three.

● (2200)

Since three levels of government now operate in the capital area, as well as jurisdictions that cross provincial boundaries, the time has come to remove planning from an appointed body such as the NCC and return it to parliament and the people of Canada through a committee of the House of Commons. Another aspect of concern because of the NCC presence in the capital is the "revolving door" or musical chairs situation which we have seen in NCC senior management. There is a great need for more continuity than is available through this non-elected body. We should not have five chairmen and five general managers in the space of ten years, nor a board of directors that does not have any local input or local officials on it. This shows a lack of concern or care.

Planning in the national capital region should never lose sight of the fact that the communities on both sides of the Ottawa River have goals and needs both as part of the national capital and as cities in their own right. The federal government should no longer enact moves which lessen the right of municipalities to govern themselves.