

comments, because they deal with this Bill to borrow \$22.6 billion for general purposes. We all know that the Government is spending money to pay its civil servants. Therefore, it has to borrow money and use part of it to pay the hard-earned salaries of our Federal civil servants.

● (1410)

[English]

I should like to address this question by referring to a recent study which took place in my riding of Ottawa—Vanier. Basically, the workers of my riding are employed by the Public Service and service industries. It does not have a very high family income group; in fact, it has the lowest in the Ottawa area. However, we are very proud of the fact that we represent one of the oldest areas of Ottawa. Its housing stock is of good quality. Over the years the previous Government showed its interest in that, and we have improved the housing stock over the last 12 years or 13 years. There is still a lot of work to be done. The study was of the impact on the Ottawa area of budget cuts, especially personnel cuts or cuts in the Public Service. I should like to refer to that study because it is a disturbing indication of trouble ahead for the Ottawa community.

I know it is not very popular outside this community to speak about Public Servants and how important they are. However, in this area there are 90,000 public servants who serve the country to the best of their ability. Presently they are being whipped around by certain groups, certain people and sometimes by the Government. They are being used as a whipping boy for the deficit of the Government, and I think unjustly so. No argument has convinced me as yet that cutting into the administrative costs of the Public Service will have much of an impact on a deficit of some \$25 billion to \$30 billion. A third of Canada's public servants work in the national capital region or, as I said, almost 90,000 of them. Of course I include in this number those who fall under the Public Service Employment Act and those who work for Canada Post, the RCMP, National Defence—and I see the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Andre) here this afternoon—and Crown corporations in the Ottawa area. Therefore they constitute an important section of the labour force.

Further, a great many Ottawa—Hull residents are engaged by the federal Government on a contract basis and draw incomes from those services. There are approximately 85,000 public servants *per se*, if we exclude all the others I have just mentioned. In any event they represent 20 per cent of the Ottawa—Hull workforce. If major cuts are made in the Government, employment in the Ottawa—Hull area is seriously affected. It results in a difficult situation.

For the residents of my riding the prospects are especially cloudy. I will show in my remarks that a significant number of people are facing lay-off at this time, basically because they are middle management, support staff or in administrative services. Furthermore, I will attempt to show, if I have the time, how difficult it is to be a young Canadian living in my

Borrowing Authority Act

riding today, expecting to follow a possible career in the Public Service of Canada and realizing that the chances of obtaining a job in the Public Service, directly or indirectly, in the Ottawa area are very meagre. I accept the one-company town approach in the Ottawa-Vanier community, but when a major employer cuts 5,000 jobs, when there is a paring back of personnel, the effect is felt by those in the modest income group.

Approximately 20 per cent of my families are single-parent families, mostly women who are earning their keep, trying to make a living and in many cases sustaining families. They are faced with a difficult situation. The Conservative Government announcement of a reduction in the Public Service did not come as a surprise to me or to them. As a matter of fact, I cannot be blamed for voting Conservative. In my riding they did not vote that way either. They knew better because in 1979 we were threatened with 60,000 cuts. If I had the time this afternoon, I would prove that again we are facing a Government which has not forgotten the 60,000 cuts. There were 15,000 cuts in the May 1984 Budget. There were 15,000 cuts affecting those who are not under the control of the Treasury Board. There was another reduction in the growth of 1 per cent per year which we in the Ottawa community had experienced over the years. It is logical that because we had a growing population in Canada we took it that the Government would be responsive to that growth with increased services, but that has not been the case. A further cut was also announced in the Nielsen task force.

Mr. Daubney: Nonsense.

Mr. Gauthier: I hear the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) saying "nonsense". Mr. Aspinall was quoted in *The Citizen*. I do not have the article here, but I could send it to the Hon. Member. If he reads the newspaper he will find that Mr. Aspinall said that those 15,000 cuts were not necessarily the bottom line, meaning that there could be similar cuts, which possibly means another 15,000. I understood it that way. The press understood it that way. If the Hon. Member for Ottawa West did not understand it that way, I wish he would rise to explain what Mr. Aspinall meant.

Mr. Weiner: Which riding does he represent?

Mr. Gauthier: That question comes from the Parliamentary Secretary. Mr. Aspinall was on the Nielsen task force which looked into all these problems, and I thought that he had knowledge of the subject and some understanding of the issue.

Let us return to the main subject at hand, what these cuts mean and why they are aimed at public servants. The cuts are aimed squarely at those public servants hired under the Public Service Employment Act, those directly under the control of the Treasury Board. That groups represented 40 per cent of all federal Government employees in 1981. Also the Government announced, on top of those cuts that "similar reductions will be made to the salary budgets of those departments and agencies whose person-years are not controlled by Treasury Board".