

accept even one dollar's worth of reduction, even though the Liberal precedent recognizes that it can be done.

• (1620)

The minority government of Lester Pearson lost three votes, again another Liberal government. Two were on appeals on rulings made by the Speaker. The third came on February 19, 1968, and ended with the defeat at third reading of Bill C-193, respecting income tax. This vote was regarded sufficiently serious to require the government to introduce a motion to the effect that the House did not consider its vote of February 19 as a vote of non-confidence in the government. This motion was passed, after debate, on February 28.

When the government loses an important vote, as it did on that vote in 1968, the government does not fall. It went on to introduce a motion of non-confidence and the government survived that vote. That is exactly what the Reform Party proposes as part of opening up the democratic process so that we can have freer and more open votes in the House and we can speak and demonstrate the will of the Canadian people.

If perchance we defeat a motion being proposed by the government, then we do not suggest that the government fall but that it be followed by a vote of non-confidence. If the government survives that vote, then the government shall remain in power. It is fairly simple, fairly clear and it allows this House to do its job.

Instead we make a mockery of democracy. We sit here in committee, we sit here in opposition, and we put forth motions. We debate them in committee and we hear from the government side that these are appropriate, they are reasonable, they are rational, they are legitimate. What happens? The answer is no.

The time has come to change. These are the types of things the Reform Party, as a matter of principle, speaking for Canadians, says. We hear what Canadians are saying. The government side is not prepared to listen. It stays with the old story of stonewalling all the way and saying that it is a matter of confidence when they find that its members agree with us that there are reductions available. Yet nothing is done.

We will see this evening if the government is brave enough to allow Parliament to do its job or if it will hide behind some outdated notion of confidence.

Before us at this time we have a motion prompted by the member for Mercier. It is to eliminate the funding for vote 10 in the human resources department, which is the grants and contributions under the employment and insurance program.

The largest single grant in vote 10 is for \$1,049,905,000. That is for payments to facilitate the efficient functioning of the

Supply

Canadian labour market. It is kind of fuzzy, but there it is. To be more specific, over \$1 billion is being spent on payments to provinces, territories, municipalities, and other public bodies, organizations, groups, communities, employers, and individuals—nobody is left out—for the provision of training and/or work experience, the mobilization of community resources and human resource planning and adjustment measures necessary for the efficient functioning of the Canadian labour market.

It is very specific. Nothing was left out. This is a very ambiguous justification for \$1 billion on that: broadly based, nobody is excluded, let us spend a billion dollars; anybody can come up with a program; let us approve it. When we talk about trying to create work, create jobs, get people back to work and we are going to spend \$1 billion in this fuzzy and unclear way, then surely it is time that we expressed an opinion, that this government listen to it, that we work together in harmony to achieve some real reductions in spending and go on to balance our budget.

• (1625)

In part III of the estimates for Human Resources Development Canada we find that it says "support for the program review exercise by contributing to the deficit reduction and continued negotiations", and so on. That statement goes on to say that the focus is to reduce expenditures. Yet we find out that they are actually going up. These types of things we have called into question.

If the government truly wants to contribute to deficit reduction then it should begin by making some serious reductions in its spending, cuts in the range of 25 per cent to the grants and contributions. Overall, the human resources development that this vote pertains to has spending increases this year from \$32.827 billion to \$33.547 billion, and that is on top of the statutory spending, which we will not even be voting on today. Vote 10 has increased from \$1.281 billion to \$1.321 billion.

Also in part III, on page 258, we take a look at the government's real efforts to manage the department and reduce expenditures. On the personnel requirements, when we went through it comparing the actuals from 1993, just before the government took office, to its estimates today for 1995-96, personnel requirements have changed by the massive number of just under 80. The government reduced it from 19,479 to 19,392 people, a reduction of 87 people.

This is where the government is trying to say it will balance the budget in a very short period of time and it will give value for money to Canadians.

We take a look at the personnel requirements and we see that it has taken from the lower salary scales. It has taken 44 people out of clerical and regulatory, where the average salary is \$27,000.