

*Government Orders*

difficult or impossible for people to feed, clothe and house the family.

Finally, I want to repeat again what I said at the beginning of these comments. I do not see how this government expects those people to pay taxes and support the Government of Canada, expecting that they are paying for services that Canadians want, any level of trust whatsoever from the Canadian public when it deals with user fees, taxes, interest rates and Crown corporations, because this government is systematically dismantling the institutions of nationhood in this country.

The next election cannot come soon enough, and the defeat of this government cannot come soon enough.

**Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan):** Mr. Speaker, may I say first that I appreciate the action of the minister in speaking to me briefly before he presented this legislation, telling me of his plans to introduce it and saying some of what he said today, that is, the bill is almost entirely housekeeping.

I am indebted to the research branch of the Library for having produced a study in quick order which endorses what the minister had to say, that is it is largely housekeeping without, of course, going into some detail.

I have taken the opportunity in the time that we have had to check with one of the labour organizations that represents a large number of government employees, and with the exception of a question relating to one of the sections, to this point, it has found nothing that would worry it as employees of the Crown.

Because of those facts and because of what I have heard about this minister to date from anyone who has had any dealings with him, I accept what he said at face value; that the bill is mainly housekeeping. This was confirmed by Library research, the opinion of the union members and, of course first and perhaps most important, the statement of the minister himself in a discussion that we had one afternoon and another evening.

I have some questions. This is sort of legislation that one cannot deal with really at second reading, because it just deals with, as the minister said, 70 different sections of the Financial Administration Act.

While I want to talk generally about it, I also want to raise some questions about some of the sections.

The minister mentioned not only that it deals with 70 sections but also that there was lengthy consultation. He did not say with whom he held the consultation. I would expect, from reading the legislation and the report that I have, that the consultation was entirely within the department and within Treasury Board staff itself.

I am not suggesting that there is anything wrong with that, but there will be an opportunity, I am sure, to ask at some later date when the bill is in committee just who was involved in the consultation and what kind of discussion there was.

During the course of his remarks, he suggested that when it comes to changing fees, for example, there would be further consultation with the people being affected. I am not sure just how meaningful that consultation will be. I expect when the minister or whoever makes a decision to change a fee—and on this I would agree with the member who preceded me—that if there is to be an adjustment of the fee, in all likelihood, it will be an upward adjustment. Any meaningful consultation will not really be engaged in, but it will simply be a matter of telling people why the government feels that the fee in this particular instance must be adjusted upward.

With regard to increasing the efficiency of service delivery, I do not believe the minister said that he was referring to the various recommendations that he has had from the Auditor General over the years. For some five years, the Auditor General has made recommendations and the Public Accounts Committee has made recommendations. I would suspect, from the reading I have done and from what I have heard, these recommendations have been more to urge increasing the efficiency of the delivery of service, than to try to adjust upward government revenues. Although, in the course of his remarks, the minister said that certainly one of the purposes of the legislation was to make a significant contribution to government revenue, he did not quantify that. I am wondering just exactly what that means, a significant contribution to government revenue.

I am aware of the province of British Columbia making some adjustments to fees over a period of about three years. When we added them all up at the end of the three years, we found out that these adjustments to fees were bringing in an extra \$500 million a year. Significant