

• (1340)

In Public Service 2000 we have a different tack now. Not only are managers going to be paid to manage, but we are also going to give them a carrot. We are going to give them something else and that is more authority. Well, that authority must be controlled.

With these amendments, all we are saying is that people in the departments have a right to and should be entitled to equal rights. All we are asking is that the House adopt the three amendments that would make investigations and audits of the commission an in-house Public Service Commission obligation. A follow-up must be done and as much as possible it must be done by somebody not within the department, not within that section of the government where the person works.

These amendments are not very difficult and I recommend them to the attention of the House.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): On these amendments dealing with auditing within the department concerned or where the complaint comes from, that procedure would be a very simple one because we have a situation here where unions express concern that the commission could delegate to or allow investigations and audits to be conducted by deputy heads.

I have just gone through some of my public accounts papers when I chaired the Standing Committee on Public Accounts for three years. Oddly enough, I found in there that we are supporting the Auditor General of Canada in having a greater control over the internal operations of departments and that is the role that any public accounts committee in this House should be playing. My colleague from Ottawa—Vanier is now chairing that committee and I am sure he would agree with me very strongly that is precisely what should take place.

Instead of bringing in a bill that is going to delegate these duties, instead of tightening up the system, where are we going to get the strong financial control in the Government of Canada? It is not only in big contracts or big deals that money sometimes is lost, but it is also all the dribbling away here and there down through the system. That is where the tax dollars are lost.

I support the Auditor General in his desire to have absolute tight control within departments. I support the

Government Orders

suggestion of my colleague from Ottawa West who brought in Motion No. 11 which specifically mentions the term "investigations and audits" which the commission might wish to delegate to other department heads.

So let us not throw the baby out with the bath water. We have had some good systems in place before which have served the country well. In passing any legislation in this House we must support the Auditor General of Canada because he is the one the public of this country looks to, to make sure that he is bringing out the wrongdoings in government, the leakages and wasted tax dollars in government, and to try to tighten up the system and give the Canadian people some value for their dollars.

In relation to Motions Nos. 9, 11 and 13, they deal with some very serious matters. Harassment is mentioned here. My hon. friend from Ottawa—Vanier mentioned one case this morning. You are going to run into some very good managers in the Public Service of Canada, but you are also going to run into some managers who cannot handle a little bit of authority. Calling somebody's home six, seven, or eight times a day I would say is a pretty good case of paranoia. These people should not be in positions of authority.

How can anybody say that by passing this legislation today we are going to increase the efficiency of the Public Service of Canada? Is that manager or his delegate getting paid on a salary or at hourly rate to pick up the phone every once in awhile to phone somebody's home like a little Gestapo agency? Why do we pay people to do those things? Is there no trust left in the system at all? If a boss cannot trust his employees, why should the employees trust the boss? That is where management comes into this system.

I want to read something relating to procedures outlined in these three amendments in a very general way. It is a report I tabled in this House on November 8, 1990, when I was chairing the public accounts committee.

Part A says: "Your committee recommends that the government give consideration to tabling a discussion paper prior to proceeding with the introduction of legislative amendments and/or administrative changes and that this discussion paper set out the principal conclusions and recommendations arising from Public Service 2000". That covers the type of details we are talking about here.