

Supply

here and there. However, he refuses to release those results and blames it on the lack of effectiveness of the model. He used it in other pieces that he put out at the same time. That demonstrates a degree of inconsistency, a refusal to be up front with the Canadian people. Frankly, I find that staggering.

That was not the only gesture. The same Minister took a hard message to Manitoba in his memo, but refused strategically to tell Manitoba about that hard message. The Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens) announced that there would be \$175 million in cuts to his Ministry's programs of regional industrial development funds. He then got up in the House of Commons and tried to pretend that those cuts were not real, that there was no real significant change in the job creation that was going to be provided by IRDP next year.

It is an attempt to obscure what is taking place that is unworthy of this Government. I remind the Government that it represents 211 constituencies. It can afford to have a little bit of grace and self confidence. It can level with the Canadian people. It does not have its hard messages. It should send them out. Let us talk about them and look at them in detail.

We have the incredible picture of a Party which just two years ago said on a point of principle that for the sake of Parliament and Parliament's rights for future, it must not allow the Government to borrow for the next financial year. They said it was not right to borrow for the future without stating what is going to do in the future. What does this Government do? It asks to borrow billions for the future. It does not even blush in doing so. At least the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) had the good grace to blush. He is prepared to admit that his job in Government is to demonstrate that the Government is not perfect. He could not have chosen a better job for himself.

Mr. Lewis: What is your job in the NDP?

Mr. Langdon: My job in the NDP is to indicate the way in which this Government has lost track of its integrity so early in its regime. That sense of drift and loss of direction is something that I express not with partisan happiness or glee, but with a sense of sadness. The people of this country wanted a change. They wanted a decent new Government that would level with Canadians, a government that would be up front.

There is a bit of irony in this motion of non-confidence being moved by the Party next to me. Talking about blushing, it might be good for them to blush for a little while. For the future of our country, we as the opposition in this House have to bring this home to the Government of Canada. The Party across the aisle is the Government. It should have the self confidence to recognize that. We must bring home to it the message that the Canadian people want an open, honest, sensitive government that will consult and co-operate. If they do not get that from this Government, I hope they will turn to us in this party to give them that kind of Government in the future.

• (1220)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions or comments on the Hon. Member's speech?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have one comment to make. The Hon. Member referred to the phrase "butcher the public sector". Perhaps the Hon. Member might explain that phrase to the House. There are some 300,000 Civil Service jobs in existence and the economic statement contemplates the reduction of 3,600 such jobs, but attrition in the public sector accounts for 13,000 jobs a year. I know that the phrase "butcher the public sector" has a very oratorical ring to it. Perhaps the Hon. Member might be able to back that statement up.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Hon. Member, I feel that central to the public sector is what it does for people. I am referring to the services which are provided to Canadians across the country. The butchery I am speaking of is the kind of butchery that is taking away millions of dollars of grants which would otherwise support alternate energy research in the country, including the elimination through the National Research Council of its program of grants for energy research. It is the kind of butchery that is cutting back research and development in the environment sector in the same way that Ronald Reagan did in the United States. It is the kind of butchery which is taking \$85 million from the CBC, an institution which in my constituency particularly is the only voice that we have to counter the overflow from the incredibly powerful communications industry in the United States.

I am referring to the kind of butchery that has told workers in the CDIC that the Government will sell their businesses without even consulting with them first. It is the kind of butchery that has taken a program like IRDP which was to have been given \$150 million more next year for grants to small businesses across the country and cut that amount out. It is a butchery which deserves to be called a butchery because it has been done without thought and without consultation.

We can deal with case after case in which programs have been cut without allowing any opportunity for provinces, communities, workers or the people to have a say. We are talking about a Government that talks rhetorically. The Hon. Member has already mentioned rhetoric. The rhetoric of the Government regarding co-operation and consultation has been magnificent. However, the record of the Government as shown by these very cuts to which I have referred has been absolutely dismal.

I thank the Hon. Member for raising that question because I had not been able in my speech to deal with the specific cuts which have been so damaging. The butchery is there. It is serious and the Conservative Government will pay the political price for it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, that answer was so unusual and so far from the point that I would like to thank the Hon. Member for it.