

*Disclosure of Documents*

**Mr. Breau:** It is the privilege of members to deal in any way they want to with these matters, but they cannot have it both ways. They cannot say, on the one hand, that the committee system does not provide enough opportunity for scrutiny of government spending and, on the other hand, act as if committees exist only to enable them to make political points. Certainly they can make political arguments; they can try to catch the headlines. That is fine. However, they cannot come here and say that the present system does not provide for parliamentary scrutiny of government spending. I submit that it does.

There are many examples to show that since estimates have been studied in committee, there has been better scrutiny. Some hon. members take time to do their homework before questioning officials. I think that is better for them, better for the minister concerned, better for parliament and better for the public. I do not think it is necessary for members of the opposition to have the forecasts of various department or to have the evaluation reports in front of them to scrutinize government spending.

The previous parliament provided opposition parties with funds for research. Some of them used this money for better scrutiny while others used it for different purposes. That is their business; they can do what they want. But they cannot say this government has not been sensitive to that problem, that it did not want better scrutiny and more intelligent discussion of government spending and legislation.

**Mr. Hueglin:** What about the Auditor General's report?

**Mr. Breau:** The hon. member refers to the Auditor General's report. There are Auditor General's reports relating to Conservative governments in Canada, and they are no better than the reports we have seen in recent years.

**Mr. Hueglin:** Stick to Ottawa.

**Mr. Breau:** It is the job of the Auditor General to be critical, to look for waste and to suggest ways in which accounting procedures can be improved. That is his job. In any big organization, certainly in any government organization, there is room for critical comments by an auditor. If we consider the provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario which have Conservative governments, and examine the reports of their provincial auditors general, we will find that the tone is about the same as that of the report tabled yesterday. In some instances they are worse.

**Mr. Stevens:** They could not be worse.

**Mr. Breau:** An hon. member on the other side was scandalized because some tenders were opened in private. Let me tell him that his supporters run provincial governments in this country which do not even call for tenders.

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I think the debate is getting somewhat off the course on which it is supposed to stay.

**Mr. Breau:** Mr. Speaker, my remarks have to do with parliamentary control. That is what this notice of motion is about. I will stick to the motion.

[Mr. Stevens.]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Question.

**Mr. Breau:** I cannot support the motion, for the reasons I have stated. Like the hon. member for York West and the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), I cannot support the motion. You cannot ask a minister to come to cabinet and make a good case for something if he must make public the reasons for his stand. That is what this motion seeks. The hon. member asks for certain forecasts to be made public. Surely that is not acceptable.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Let us take the vote and find out.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being six o'clock, the time appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired and I do now leave the chair. The House will resume at eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**
**CRIMINAL CODE**
**REINSTATEMENT OF LAW RELATING TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT THAT EXISTED PRIOR TO DECEMBER 30, 1972**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-2, to amend the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, at five o'clock I was indicating to the House that on the basis of my personal persuasions—and they represent the views of the majority of the people I have consulted in the city of Edmonton and the surrounding area—I do not favour the passage of this bill. The people whom I consulted preferred the law of 1961.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) discussed one aspect of this matter the other day on which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) expressed great reserve. That was the question of the royal prerogative. The royal prerogative has been used in countless cases. In fact, it has been used in all cases since the last execution in 1962, sometimes literally one minute before midnight, even after the government had announced it would not interfere with the sentence. I recall in particular a case in Montreal generally known as the Santa Claus murders.

This question of the royal prerogative bothers me. It exists in law. We are not attacking the authority of the constitutional monarch in these matters, but the consideration and advice given to the monarch, or the monarch's representative, which must be followed is that of the treasury benches. Knowing something about the composi-