

*Time Allocation*

within the Treasury Board. That sort of empire created for the edification of one bureaucrat, is simply not acceptable to Members on this side of the House. The sort of framework which is being put in place to justify the building of an empire by Dr. Clark is totally unacceptable to Members on this side of the House.

In addition to the person-years which he has asked for, he is also hiring \$1,000 a day consultants. How can the Government seriously talk about the need for financial control when it allows its friend, Dr. Clark, to spend public funds in this way? If the Minister is serious about exercising control on spending and government activities, surely a good place to start would be in Dr. Clark's shop itself by indicating to Ed Clark that this sort of empire building at public expense must stop.

● (1530)

If this Bill is forced through, its first effect will be, notwithstanding the statements that were made by the Minister, that we will probably never again see in the House a special Act of incorporation for a Crown corporation. This Bill will allow the Government to do without those special Acts in the future and will formalize a procedure whereby the Government need not come back to seek parliamentary approval for legislation to create new Crown corporations.

This Bill would limit the ability of parliamentary committees to do their job. How extraordinary it is that any Minister of the Crown would expect Members of Parliament from any Party to accept a provision in legislation which explicitly states that after this Bill is passed a parliamentary committee would have no right to move concurrence in its report on a government Order in Council. How shocking it is that this provision was dreamed up and that the Government is attempting to sneak it through Parliament. The low regard that the Government has for Parliament is appalling.

It is equally shocking that this Bill seeks to exclude Orders in Council relating to these Crown corporations from the scrutiny of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments. One of the responsibilities of that Committee is to look at the *vires* and legality of government Orders in Council, yet the Committee will be prevented from doing that because the Minister, in the name of improving accountability, wants to prevent Parliament from acting in that way.

I want to ask the Minister if he deliberately proposed legislation to Parliament that would have the effect, within 60 days of passage, of requiring the winding up of the Bank of Canada, the Canadian Wheat Board and the International Development Research Centre? That is exactly what this Bill does. Is it his intention to do that through the back door by this sort of measure, or is it a matter of extreme sloppiness on his part and that of his officials who drafted a Bill, the consequences of which they were not even knowledgeable? One of my colleagues will deal with this issue at greater length during the debate.

In light of the great national controversy over the comments by the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) about the possi-

bility of asking Governor Bouey of the Bank of Canada to take his leave, I find it incredible that the Minister would be so sloppy as to allow a Bill to be put before Parliament which would have the effect of winding up the Bank of Canada within 60 days of the Bill's passage. How grossly incompetent.

The Minister is probably prepared to make approximately 30 amendments to the Bill when it is before committee. He will no doubt cite this as a sign that he is prepared to co-operate with Members of Parliament in improving the Bill. More properly, this should be seen as a confession on the part of the Minister that the Bill is so sloppily and improperly worded that he has not done his homework. He should admit that he is asking Parliament to give approval at second reading stage for legislation that is grossly inadequate and should never have been brought before the House of Commons.

The Minister says that this legislation has met with the support of the Auditor General. Again, I find disgraceful the Minister's behaviour in using the Auditor General the way he did, by taking advantage of private correspondence sent to him by the Auditor General to claim his support. The Auditor General, just as Members of the House, did not have an opportunity to see the regulations we are talking about.

We are faced with legislation that undercuts Parliament and reduces our ability to do our job on behalf of the taxpayers of Canada. Far from improving accountability, it destroys and denies accountability. It is a bad Bill which will be strongly opposed by Members on this side of the House. Certainly time allocation, which is designed to gag Parliament and undermine its ability to hold the Government to account on this Bill, will be strongly opposed by every Member on this side of the House.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, in my response to the closure motion I want to indicate our reasons for our opposition to it. Since there is no doubt that the objectives of this Bill are valid, we believe there should be some discussion about the requirements of accountability over Crown corporations. There is no question that this Bill would be an improvement to the accountability process of these Crown corporations. However, the fundamental question we are considering with respect to this Bill is the definition of accountability, which is the principle that needs to be debated and studied very closely.

What is the meaning of accountability in Crown corporations, or in government for that matter? Parliamentary accountability means being accountable to the House of Commons. The primary responsibility in the House of Commons is to be accountable for the expenditure of taxpayers' money. This view, which is shared by the Auditor General, means that Parliament should vote on all of the expenditure of taxpayers' money. He has also said that this Bill is an improvement in the accountability for taxpayers' money. I will expand on that opinion in a few minutes.

Accountability also means the responsibility of a Crown corporation to fulfil its mandate. In this respect the Bill is