

*Government Orders*

Part B reads: "Referring the aforementioned discussion paper to a special committee of the House on reform of the Public Service and that the special committee conduct a consultation process involving employees, the Public Service unions and other interested parties and report back to the House within a reasonable period".

At first, the President of Treasury Board wrote me a letter. He thought it was a tremendous idea and he was willing to adopt it. Then he went ahead and did the very opposite. He brought the legislation into the House and what do we see today? Not only did he not have full consultation with the Public Service of Canada as he promised me as chairman of the public accounts committee that he would do, but he also brought legislation into the House and skipped the process altogether. That is why we have this legislation before us today.

The government has compounded the difficulty of dealing with Public Service reform today because not only did it just bring the bill forward for discussion on report stage today but it has also put a time limit on this bill when it must be passed by the House.

We might as well face the facts. The government had its mind made up right from the start, right from the beginning on what it wanted to do. It was going to do that regardless of who said what or what process took place in the Parliament of Canada or in the public accounts committee or any other committee dealing with this issue. That is the ramrodding business this government goes through.

One of the people we had the most trouble with during the discussion of Public Service 2000 was none other than Mr. Tellier who has just now been promoted to head up the CNR. I hope he can run a railroad better than he ran the government business at that time.

He was always very agitated when he had to come before the public accounts committee. He even sometimes suggested when his officials should appear and when they should not. We ran into many problems with Mr. Tellier. I must say with regret that I was very disappointed in the type of co-operation we had from him and his little department.

• (1350)

Now I come back to the same thing, right to the beginning. If we are going to have good conduct in the Public Service of Canada, if we are going to have value for the tax dollars of the taxpayers of Canada, and if we are going to have proper auditing then I would very strongly suggest that the Auditor General of Canada must work very closely with the Public Service Commission when these audits are done in departments. We do not want someone else fixing things up before the Auditor General has a chance to report them to the Canadian public at large. That is his job.

The Auditor General has specialists in his department. He has about 670 or 690 employees over there and he brings people in on contracts to do special types of projects. He can bring somebody in on contract to do a particular investigation or audit in a department if he sees that there is a serious problem there.

Let us make sure, as we go on with this legislation, that the Auditor General is going to play the responsible role on behalf of all Canadians in departments of government and it is not going to be delegated to someone who is going to fix up the problem and as a result the public are not going to know what dollars were lost.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise to speak on these amendments. It is important in any large organization that complaints of personal, sexual or other types of harassment be treated with a great deal of dispatch in an independent investigation and that there be some method of reporting back to the people involved.

Over the last period of time we have become much more sensitive to harassment in the work place. Certainly the issue of sexual harassment has become a major focus of attention, not only in government work places but also in industrial work places and places like the Armed Forces.

Sexual harassment has been pervasive within our work force for many years and has resulted in the inability of women to contribute to the maximum and to their potential in support of themselves and to the betterment of the total community. However, there are other kinds of personal harassment that this legislation would also assist.