

authority, resources, skills and incentive to perform these functions effectively.

Organization: the appropriateness of the manner in which financial management and control responsibilities have been allocated to and within central agencies and departments.

The results of these studies will be a report provided to the deputy head under the headings of background, analysis and recommendations plus the observations of the study teams with respect to any weaknesses in the system of financial management and control within his department. Each deputy head is being requested to inform the Auditor General on any corrective action taken.

Parliament will be informed of these results in the 1975 Annual Report of the Auditor General. In a supplementary volume, there will also be a report on the government-wide findings and recommendations followed by a précis of the results of the examination made in each department and agency and the responses of the deputy head.

Your Committee endorses this wide-ranging program being carried out and is encouraged by the Auditor General's confidence that on the basis of the Report of the Independent Review Committee on the Office of the Auditor General of Canada tabled in the House April 14, 1975, his Office will be launched successfully in 1978, on its second century, and will serve the Office and Parliament itself for years to come.

Your Committee has concluded its review of the Auditor General's 1974 Report, and has observed on those paragraphs where weak administration and the lack of financial controls will require further action by the government departments and agencies concerned.

Your Committee anticipates within the next six months a formal response to the matters raised in this Report from the Secretary of the Treasury Board.

During the course of this review, your Committee was unable to do a more thorough study of the subject areas concerned, because the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1974 had not been referred to it by the House.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends that consideration should be given to the advisability of changing the Standing Orders of the House of Commons to provide that the Public Accounts of Canada and the annual report of the Auditor General thereon be automatically referred to your Committee and that, if your Committee has not already been organized, it should be set up within a reasonable period after such referral.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 22 to 36 inclusive, First Session, Thirtieth Parliament*) is tabled.

The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the Report recorded as Appendix No. 143 to the Journals).

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Act. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 301-1/308C.

Ordered,—That the document "Summary of the surtax proposal" presented to the House by the Honourable the Minister of Finance be printed as an appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

Ordered,—That copies of letters, dated December 11 and 12, 1975, addressed by Keith Spicer, Esq., Commissioner of Official Languages to Sylvain Cloutier, Esq., Deputy Minister of Transport, relating to the suspension of three air traffic controllers at Dorval Air Traffic Control Centre, laid upon the Table on December 17, 1975, by the Honourable the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), be printed as an appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

Ordered,—That the House revert to "Routine Proceedings" at 8.00 o'clock p.m. this day.

Ordered,—That any Government Order interrupted this day retain its position on tomorrow's *Order Paper*.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return:

No. 3,073—*Mr. Rodriguez*

1. For each transaction or contract of \$1 million or more in the Post Office National Facilities Programme (a) what is the value of the contract or transaction (b) what are the principal features of the transaction (e.g., size and description of land, size of building, quantity of equipment, etc.) (c) what is the name of the company involved (d) who are the principal owners and officers of the company (e) in what manner was the contract let (f) was the contract tendered and, if not, for what reason (g) did the contract go to the lowest bidder and, if not, what are the names of the bidders and the amount of their bid (h) what is the location of the post office involved?

2. What is the basic cost of (a) LSMs (b) CFCs (c) OCRs and, for what reason is there such a wide variation in planned costs of LSMs (e.g., 3 in Winnipeg for \$4.7 million, 3 in Scarborough for \$4.0 million, 7 in Vancouver for \$6.6 million, etc.)?

3. Are land costs excluded for major projects in Toronto and Montreal and, if so, for what reason?

4. What is the (a) maximum (b) minimum number of (i) LSMs (ii) CFCs (iii) OCRs that might be expected to be operating by 1980 and what centres are affected in each case?

5. What are the CUPW staffing estimates associated with each estimate in Part 4 compared to current staffing?

6. What is the breakdown by classification and major job function for each large centre?