

the statement made by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce in its pre-budget submission to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Guay), in which it stated:

Loss of business confidence stems in large part from the contradiction between the government's stated intention of decreasing its involvement in private sector decision-making, on the one hand, and legislation creating excessive surveillance and "fine tuning" of private business decisions, on the other.

Not only the chambers of commerce but the majority of the Canadian people find they can no longer place any faith in the government. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) first took office he stated emphatically that he intended to lead this country more to the left of the spectrum. I think it was 18 months ago that he said in a television conversation that the free enterprise system was not working and that we would have to change the system accordingly. Nowadays the government is saying exactly the opposite; it is saying we must involve the private sector to a greater degree.

To deal specifically with Bill C-10, it is my hope that abuses and shortcomings such as those to which I have referred will be remedied, to some extent at least, by its provisions and that the waste of public funds will be reduced.

I should like to refer at this point to a booklet put out by Edward Murphy of Vancouver entitled: "A Legacy of Spending". On the first page there is a clipping which states that it is the Prime Minister's intention to cut the civil service by 10 per cent. He also plans to curb government spending. The booklet is dated August 14, 1969.

● (2132)

If we look at what happened in reality as compared to what was stated in this article, we find that since 1969 government spending has increased by some 201 per cent. We find that the civil service has increased by some 45 per cent. Mr. Speaker, it is any wonder why the Canadian people have no faith in this administration? The government's own backbenchers are condemning it for mismanagement. A short time ago the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Lee) stated that government spending was out of control. The story was carried in an article by the Vancouver *Province* dated September 29, 1975.

One can go through an entire list of waste and government mismanagement of public funds. I refer to an article in this booklet which states that CIDA's president spent some \$20,000 to have a speech prepared for himself. We then come to a study which was commissioned by the International Development Research Centre which announced a grant to conduct an infertility study. They received \$84,000. I find it humorous too to go through some of the Canada Council grants. Canada Council in total has spent in excess of \$400 million. When one reviews, where some of this funding has gone, it makes one sick. It has gone to support filth.

Everything is illustrated in this book and I dare not put it in the record because it is such filth. We have members opposite and in this party who are debating legislation before the justice committee dealing with pornography. If members on the opposite side were sincere in the application of what they are stating, they would start to clean up their own house first.

Financial Administration Act

When we see the smut that is being supported by the Liberal administration, it is simply appalling.

There are a few other illustrations I wish to share with hon. members covered under Canada Council grants. In 1971 a grant of close to \$40,000 was made so that a study could be made of the Alberta electorate. I am puzzled why \$40,000 would be allocated to study the electorate in Alberta, because they have done a fine job over the last three years in sending representatives to this House of Commons. I do not feel Alberta needs any studying.

We find too that some \$48,000 was granted to study the fertility of families in Quebec. Why would \$48,000 be granted to study fertility of families in Quebec? That is the second such grant; there was another one for \$50,000.

Miss Bégin: What is wrong with it?

Mr. Elzinga: Why should we spend Canadian taxpayers' money on studies like this?

Miss Bégin: We need population in this country. You are against babies?

Mr. Elzinga: No.

Miss Bégin: Explain!

Mr. Elzinga: I am curious as to why the government would want to know the fertility rate in Quebec and spend some \$50,000 of the taxpayers' money.

An hon. Member: How many babies does she have?

Mr. Elzinga: Maybe I could ask the hon. minister how many babies she has.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Elzinga: I think she is a very responsible minister who is doing a great job. She is doing a much better job than those who are taking care of the Canadian taxpayers' money, and that is exemplified by the way it has been spent over the last 10 years.

In conclusion, I wish to underscore a few things that have been brought forward by the hon. member for Calgary Centre, who is our critic in this area. He did a great job in putting forward our position when he opened the debate after the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Lefebvre) spoke. The hon. member for Calgary Centre stated that it was vital there be a Comptroller General in place in the government apparatus, to use the words of the Auditor General, "to bring this serious situation under control". It is absolutely essential that we do have legislative authority to perform that function. We intend to propose amendments along those lines to ensure this responsible position is accountable to the parliament of Canada rather than just the government itself.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the public accounts committee for a