

the past that, as I understand it, because of the fact that the Public Service Commission is not a department of Government and supposedly is independent of Government, if there is a recommendation by a parliamentary committee with respect to it, it will not be acted upon by the Public Service Commission because it does not feel that the force of Parliament stands behind it.

If this motion by the Hon. Member is adopted then Parliament will have, for the first time, I understand it, agreed and approved recommendations of a parliamentary committee with respect to the Public Service Commission. It will therefore have the force of Parliament behind it, the force of the people of Canada behind it, and the Public Service Commission will not have the option to ignore it, but must move forward and adopt it.

It is with that in mind that I would like to support very strongly the motion made by the Hon. Member, and I trust that the House will agree to adopt the tenth report of the Public Accounts Committee.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I only want to take a few minutes to reiterate and agree with the comments made by my colleague for Ottawa-Vanier when he brought to our attention today the very good recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee.

I would be remiss in my remarks if I did not start by congratulating the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) for the excellent work that she does in chairing the Public Accounts Committee. I know that every Member of this House would agree with me in that regard.

As a member from the national capital area I am very concerned with some of the problems that we see right now whereby it takes between 136 to 160 days to fill vacant positions in the Government. There are two reasons why, of course, that I am very concerned with this.

*[Translation]*

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that when a position remains vacant for 150 or 160 days, which is almost six months, the former incumbent's co-workers have to do that person's job in addition to their own work. The present system therefore puts an additional burden on the other employees, and it is unfair to make them do the work of other people just because our bureaucracy has become so slow-moving.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the Hon. Member for Richelieu (Mr. Plamondon), who is listening very attentively down there, that today, many of my constituents in the National Capital Region are unemployed. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in the National Capital Region is rising, although it seems to be going down almost everywhere else in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation for my constituents. The eastern part of my riding, as you know, and as the Hon. Members opposite know, around Hawkesbury, has an

unemployment rate of about of about 14 or 15 per cent. That is pretty serious.

But as you know, in this particular region the percentage of people working for the Government in Ottawa is relatively low. Many of my constituents who are public servants in the Ottawa-Hull area tend to live in Orleans, Cumberland and the general area, as you know of course, and these people had been in relatively good shape in recent years during the recession and after, since there was not as much unemployment in the federal Government as there was in the private sector. However, Mr. Speaker, today the situation has been reversed, which means that many of my constituents are now unemployed or are losing their jobs while other Canadians, especially in the Province of Ontario, are seeing an improvement in their economic situation.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, that when positions remain vacant for six months, it means that one of my constituents remains unemployed for that long, and I think it is important to bring this to the attention of the House, to repeat the points raised by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), who informed the House so eloquently on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a few words about the lay-off or surplus list, which includes employees who are about to lose their jobs, and some of them have already left as a result of the measures introduced by the Minister of Finance, who is sitting there in his seat, and the President of the Treasury Board, the executioners of the Public Service—it is important that we bring to the attention of these two Ministers that a large number of Canadians, about 2,000 or 3,000 people, are now on this lay-off list, some of whom have already lost their jobs or are about to do so very shortly. Now if this waiting list were compressed or shortened, as it were, many of these people could be re-hired by the federal Public Service and be employed instead of staying home on unemployment insurance or welfare or any of the other programs that are open to the unemployed.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that it is very important for the House to adopt today—and I ask Hon. Members from all parties, including the Hon. Member for Richelieu (Mr. Plamondon), my good friend over there, to support this Bill, even the Minister of Finance, because it is still time for him to reform, to make up for the way his restrictions and budgetary cutbacks have affected federal public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear from an Hon. Member, the Member on my right, I may say on my far right, in the Conservative Party, that the Minister of Finance had no choice. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, did the same Minister of Finance have a choice when he could have cut the Prime Minister's unnecessary spending? He had a choice there, and in fact a very clear and a very easy choice, and I'm delighted the Conservative Member brought this to my attention. They could have easily cut spending there. They could have said: Enough of this wasting of taxpayers' money, enough of these