

### Government Orders

public, better access to the government by the public and less cost to the taxpayer.

Here are even more good reasons why we should pass Bill C-52 so as to give the department a clear, legislative mandate to continue its work in this area.

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, it always astonishes me when I listen to speeches like the one my colleague has just given about how to save money in government.

We spend so much time in speech in this country talking about a \$3.5 million saving from reducing the paper burden. I am sure it could be a lot more than that, and a possible \$176 million saving in other efficiencies.

I guess the Liberal government does not get the idea here. We overspend the revenue we take in by \$40 billion a year. That is 40,000 million dollars. We have a half a trillion dollar debt load. Our interest payments are well over \$40 billion a year.

What really gets me is that the Liberals come up with this much money to actually handle a problem that is this big. I guess my question really is this. Will the \$3.5 million saving—I hate to talk about such a small amount here—or \$176 million ever be reflected as a reduction in any budget in the government? Past experience shows that none of these budgets has ever been reduced in 20 years.

Where are the efficiencies? Do not come into the House and talk about saving money. You have done nothing but blow money since the day you got here. Would you mind answering the question?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair, would members please, when saying “you”, refer to the Chair and not to the member opposite.

**Ms. Cohen:** Mr. Speaker, I only have eyes for you, sir, I can tell you that. I am happy to speak to my hon. friend through you and to remind my hon. friend that \$3.5 million plus \$3.5 million plus \$3.5 million adds up.

It is one saving on top of another on top of another. We could do what the Reform Party suggested in its campaign and just knock billions off the top indiscriminately, thereby destroying the economy and putting people out on the street. We could do what the governor of Michigan did, for instance, and lob money off the top.

● (1705)

I would like to invite my hon. friend to come to Windsor sometime and we will take him over to Detroit. He can watch people who have suffered under the kind of regime that the Reform Party suggests. He can watch people living in the streets when it is cold and when the weather is inclement. He can watch those things. Or he can watch us save \$3.5 million here and \$4.5

million there. He can watch us reorganize the government and he can watch us deliver.

This is not the last nine years. This is the beginning of a very long period of time for the Liberal government and a very long period of time of Liberal efficiency. This is the beginning of a new life for Canada.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about the beginning. Let me remind the member that it is almost a year since the election. The beginning was a year ago. If the Liberals had been serious about real cuts they could have cut the budget by, let us say, \$10 billion.

The Reform Party laid out a \$15 billion program to cut the deficit. If it had been implemented, the interest costs on the debt alone, assuming an interest rate of 7 to 10 per cent, could have been \$1 billion ahead in the bank just by reducing interests costs by really aggressively attacking the deficit.

We are talking about \$3.5 million here, \$100 million there. Just by getting the job done the hon. member could save \$1 billion.

The Minister of Human Resources Development tabled a discussion paper. He has been working for a whole year and all he can produce is a discussion paper.

When can we expect that we will move beyond these minuscule paper saving propositions that make a minuscule cut? When can we expect the real stuff that is going to prevent the economy from collapsing under the weight of debt and interest that we have to pay?

**Ms. Cohen:** Mr. Speaker, it is true it has been almost a year. October 25 will be our first anniversary. During that period we have had an opportunity to assess and to see the precise situation in which the government has found itself.

The full integration of this department will result in savings of \$180 million and 4,000 full time equivalent jobs between the 1993-94 fiscal year and 1997-98 representing a reduction of about 25 per cent of the current complement.

The emphasis is on reducing overhead through streamlining and eliminating duplication. These targets will not affect the delivery of services but will result in savings of \$1 billion over the next few years. This is not chicken feed. It is a lot of money. I am very sorry if we did not do it as quickly as the other side of the House would like.

Everything is simple over there. Somehow you give people guns and they will not shoot each other any more. We will have law and order. Knock 20 per cent off the budget and people starve in the streets and I guess we do not have as many people to feed. That is a very simple view.

Over here where the responsible people live, we can say that we have studied it, we have looked at it and it has only just begun.