

Routine Proceedings

Mr. de Cotret: Our approach to managing the size of the Public Service was based on this government's over-all plan to manage better. We are now doing things more effectively.

Over the next five years we will continue to carefully control the size of the Public Service. We will do this because we are committed to ensuring that over the medium term we maintain the balance between federal employment and total employment in the economy.

Let me say that this progress would not have been possible without a dedicated and highly professional Public Service.

Last December, the Prime Minister announced an initiative called Public Service 2000. This initiative will ensure a Public Service that can provide Canadians with the best value for their tax dollars.

In 1984, we committed ourselves to managing the economy and managing the government. Good management is not easy. It requires hard work, tough decisions and leadership. It requires a plan and the will to carry out that plan. This is what this government is doing. Our Expenditure Control Plan, in achieving this reduction, this saving of \$19.5 billion, is evidence of our commitment.

We promised fiscal responsibility. This government is delivering. We promised to get the deficit under control, and we are delivering. We promised to cut expenditure growth, and we are delivering. We promised to manage government better, and we are delivering.

• (1140)

I am proud of this government's record. We have acted decisively in bringing about the kind of changes needed to ensure Canada's economic stability, and to ensure that Canadians are able to meet the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, this morning, members of this House had an information session where we were told that the minister responsible, the President of the Treasury Board, would provide us some information today and some later; that the rules of this House were there and

that we could follow them when it suited the minister, but when it did not suit him, we could forget about them.

Mr. Robichaud: Disrespect for the House!

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Here is the list in the Estimates with respect to which departments we have little or no details as to what is going on within those departments: CIDA, Communications, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Energy Mines and Resources, Finance, Fisheries and Oceans, Health and Welfare, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Multiculturalism, National Defence, Industry, Science and Technology, Secretary of State, Transport and Veterans Affairs.

Do you know what we know about those departments, Madam Speaker? We know that there are cuts, period. That is all we know. We do not know what programs are being cut, other than the information we received in the one or two minutes of briefing that we got at 10.55 this morning.

We do not know anything that is in the Part IIIs of the Estimates because they were not tabled this morning pursuant not only to the rules of this House, because they form part of the Estimates, but pursuant to directives that this House gave to the government when it unanimously adopted a report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts in 1983.

Why is the government behaving this way? It says that the Estimates would have probably been wrong anyway so it was better to disobey the rules of the House. That is Tory logic for you.

If this government did not know that you needed time to print the Estimates between the date of the budget and the date of the Estimates, well then why in blazes could it not have brought in the budget a few days earlier to give it time? You would think that it is someone from outer space who came here to present the budget, totally divorced from the government. The ministers are only one seat away from each other. There is approximately one or two inches between the chair of the minister responsible for the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance. Maybe they could speak to each other, or correspond if they are not on speaking terms.

Either way they could ensure between the two of them that they live within the rules we have adopted in this House and the rules which governments successively have followed, including this government in the past.