

In implementing this process the government will, one, establish constructive partnerships with provincial governments; two, use federal-provincial administrative agreements to provide Canadians with efficient responsive programs and services; and, three, utilize both bilateral and multilateral negotiations to obtain timely results and ensure maximum flexibility. Those negotiations are going on constantly. Finally, we work to ensure that the negotiation process is transparent to all participants; that is, based on equality of treatment and sound public policy objectives.

The government then is entering this process with an open mind and is prepared to be flexible in accommodating provincial needs and priorities.

We recognize that in many areas provinces have developed the best practices and that the federal government has much to learn from them and we are following in our negotiations with the provinces a path where we are looking at their programs to consider which are most effective in that regard.

Therefore we are prepared to consider, one, what level of government is best suited to delivering a certain service or program. As I said before, we are open-minded in this regard. We are furthermore considering how to make policies and programs more effective and affordable and more accessible to clients. As the minister said earlier today, the goal is service enhancement above all else.

In terms of the flexibility about which I spoke earlier we want to be flexible in developing common objectives and in choosing issues for negotiations. These will be done item by item, province by province, department by department. We will conduct negotiations bilaterally if necessary and multilaterally if it is possible, again depending upon particular needs.

We will where possible use pilot projects such as the New Brunswick works project which was referred to earlier by the member for Peterborough. That project offers real hope we believe in the area of employment training and social services reform.

All of these initiatives we believe demonstrate important features of our federation, ones that are the envy of many other nations. It is especially gratifying in an age where disputes between governments are an every day occurrence that our leaders, provincial and federal, have agreed to set aside differences and search together for solutions that are in the best interest of the public.

In that regard, Mr. Bruce Doern, a student of governmental reform in England, Australia, New Zealand and most recently Canada, has written about the experience over the last two decades and I would like to bring attention to his comments:

### *Supply*

What the full experience of the last two decades perhaps shows most of all is the need to reduce ideological blinkers and be much more selective about which functional and organizational aspects of government are efficiency and democracy enhancing—and which are reducing.

A thinking view of the State is far more important to Canadians than an ideological one that simply bashes bureaucracy and government or attacks market-based approaches as a form of ritual sport.

• (1610)

It is not a time for ritual sports of that type, it is a time to work together in service enhancement and making government work.

In terms of the PS 2000 report, a progress report as I have said is being produced. We are comparing what is being done here as the Auditor General did in his report. We find that in many ways we have not kept up. It is true the previous government did not. However in comparing our progress with that of the United States, in fact in the terms of the re-invent government agenda of Vice President Gore, one finds in that agenda that we have done many of the things he is calling for in the United States.

The federal government views the reduction of overlap and duplication as called for in this motion as a win-win situation for governments and for taxpayers. It will render programs more affordable and thus sustainable over time while providing Canadians with the best service possible within the limits of available resources.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the comments, especially when the member was specific about relating some of the things I was concerned about in my presentation.

I wonder if the member has any more details as to when the PS 2000 report will be tabled in the House.

**Mr. English:** Mr. Speaker, there is one progress report already which the member has probably seen. It was given to some members of your party a couple of days ago. Two members of your party asked for that report.

The second report is being prepared now. It has been slowed down by the election and the events in between. It is in almost final draft form, but I can check that. It is one that compares what we are doing with what is being done in other countries. I refer the member of course to the Auditor General's comments which make those comparisons as well.

In terms of the whole business of renewing the public service and looking at these questions, it is being given active consideration.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I might make the point here that we all make this mistake, and I do too, of not addressing remarks through the Chair. I think the parliamentary secretary used the expression your or you twice in two sentences. Once per paragraph at least, please.