

should cut spending. We have a considerable debt, and we are told that we should cut into the bureaucracy. However, every time we mention one area where we are asking people to improve spending controls, the opposition's attitude, and I think this is rather depressing, is always the same: They say we are not cutting the right things. They say we should not cut spending. However, if we listened to them, we would never do anything at all.

**Mr. Côté:** Let's cut the opposition!

**Mr. DeBlois:** I certainly wouldn't mind cutting the opposition as the hon. member just suggested, but after all, under our democratic system we have to accept the fact of our hon. friends opposite—is it partisanship or petty politics? Who knows! However, I can tell you that we have the guts, and I say this without hesitation, I think we have the guts to try, and even to succeed. I think we shall succeed in putting our financial house in order. What are we asking the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety to do? Just this: Try and upgrade your cost recovery policy. It is entirely normal that an agency funded by the government, by your taxes and mine, in which employers and the unions participate jointly with the federal government, that that agency recover its costs when it provides information to people who want that information. In any case, the centre is not the only agency that works on a cost recovery, fee-for-service basis. I don't think this measure is intended to kill an agency that has provided excellent service. Its purpose is simply to get everyone more involved, starting with the unions, the employers and those who receive these services.

Madam Speaker, we are almost caught in a vicious circle. They tell us: Put your financial house in order. Because of the deficit we are cutting back on funding for the centre, and if we do not apply this strategy, our social programs will be at risk. In my riding, there are senior citizens who disagree with me and say: You are cutting some of the things we get, like the old age pension clawback for people with gross incomes around \$70,000, or a net income of \$50,000. However, I tell my senior citizens: Listen! You are lucky. Who knows whether in 15 or 20 years, when a Liberal government from which the Lord preserve us is in power again, we will still be able to afford old age pensions? I am not sure, Madam Speaker, even though I am old enough. I am not sure than when I

### *Private Members' Business*

am 65, I will be able to collect my old age pension, not because I will be one of the fortunate whose gross income is over \$50,000 or \$70,000, but if we do not put our financial house in order, if we do not make some unpleasant cuts—I am always struck by the fact that everyone agrees with cuts, but no one wants cuts in areas that affect them.

• (1320)

It is the same with the GST. We had a lot of organizations come here to tell us, regarding our proposed goods and services tax, that they agreed with changing the federal tax. They said, "The present tax is inefficient and full of loopholes. We agree with your plan, but exempt us. Don't touch us!" In other words, they agree with restoring the government's finances and making cuts, but they say, "Please don't make cuts that affect us!"

I understand why the hon. member for Hamilton West defends the Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, which is probably in his riding. I would do so the same thing if I were in his place. If this centre were in the beautiful riding of Montmorency—Orléans, I would certainly be hurt. I think that he is defending it well and skilfully.

That said, I think that beyond our own riding, we must see the national interest. The national interest now requires all organizations receiving federal funds to make an effort. No federal agency, no organization that depends on the federal government, should be spared from this collective effort which applies to everything under federal jurisdiction.

Madam Speaker, I do not want to dwell on it. I think we are talking calmly and dispassionately and saying, "Can this very important organization in Canadian life not—" and I think people understand. From what I have read, people who deal with the CCOSH are not surprised that they have to pay part of the costs related to the documentation and information they receive.

For all these reasons, I do not think it is necessary to ask the government to reconsider its policy of requiring this agency to cover more of its costs. Therefore, I must unfortunately vote against the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton West and support the government in its decision to require more financial responsibility of the