

expenditures are for. Since most of the estimates do not even go to the committees, they do not get even a superficial type of examination. The minister has indicated that we have now established a Comptroller General and that we have a new force in the Auditor General's Department. But parliament is asking someone else to make the decision for it.

Since I have been here members of parliament have been talking about horses on the payroll and the expenditures at Mirabel where we bought land which we are not going to use. When the threat of an election loomed, it was necessary for Toronto not to feel cheated, so we said that the land in Pickering should also be purchased. We will have an airport at Pickering, not because we need one but because we have to balance it with Mirabel where great abuses have taken place for the same reason, namely, to elect the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: These huge expenditures are not made for the people. The people in Montreal did not ask for that airport. They found it very easy to get to Dorval, and they found transport facilities to Dorval very good. Now every time I go to Montreal I hear dozens of complaints about how hard it is to get from Dorval to Mirabel or from Montreal to Mirabel, and anybody who has driven from Ottawa to Mirabel knows that they have not put up a sign telling you to turn off to Hawkesbury to get on to the Quebec side to get to Mirabel.

All these expenditures and extravagances have been made for one purpose so far as the public is concerned.

An hon. Member: Even the airlines did not want Mirabel.

Mr. Peters: That is true. The people who did not like it most were the airlines, and most of them are not satisfied even today.

A number of changes have been suggested by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization and by the whips of the parties. Several weeks ago I heard the Liberal whip making a very interesting dissertation on changes that should be made to assist members of parliament to make more reasonable decisions on expenditures. Changes are talked about, but normally are overridden by the need to pass legislation, and therefore allowances are not made to members to participate in gaining an understanding of what are the expenditures of the nation.

I am pleased to learn today that the government has provided members of parliament with two bills. My colleague will probably be able to tell me what the expenditures in those two bills are. I looked at both of them and in one I found an expenditure of about \$311 million, I presume. In the other one I was not able to ascertain what is the bottom line in the bill. As we approach March 31 we will be making an expenditure of something like \$52 billion or \$53 billion. Most of the items that will go into making up that amount have never even been discussed by members of parliament.

There is no machinery which allows members of parliament to make a decision about these expenditures, and for this

Waste and Mismanagement

reason the general public is very unhappy and dissatisfied, to the extent that an article appeared in a newspaper the other day which probably makes a lot of sense to most Canadians. It talks about one of the large supermarkets which has decided to forget all the hoopla, forget all the name items, forget about all the brand name labels like Trudeau, Clark and Broadbent, and choose a no-label party. There is a lot of merit in a no-label party because we have not spent a lot of money and time building the images. There are no brand names, no images to indicate to the Canadian public what will happen, and obviously after the election none of those things will happen.

All members are interested in controlling the expenditures. Proposition 13 in the United States is not dead in Canada. In fact it is badly abused in some parts of Canada. Today we heard a member from Manitoba talk about the joys of many of those abuses where you cut down on the services that are asked for by people, where you cut down on things to which Canadians have become accustomed. Eventually we will have to develop a mechanism, if this institution is to function, that will allow a scrutiny of expenditures before they are made. I believe the Standing Committee on Public Accounts has done a very good job, but it is dealing with accounts after the fact—accounts after something has been spent.

● (2020)

If one looks at some of the items we will pass later this evening, one will find that many of them are dollar items, not statutory items but transfer ones. The initial reason for putting those items down has changed. It has been decided that those moneys will be used for something else. It gives us an opportunity of knowing exactly why we are passing the moneys. We are passing items that are only a transfer from one estimate to another.

There are abuses in the expenditures. Some abuses which are taking place can be controlled and there are other abuses which cannot be controlled. Now that we have made the decision to spend money for the infrastructure across the river, what will happen? Now that it has been decided that we will not go into the business of bilingualism and will cut back on the expenditures of training people in a second language, whether it be English or French, what will happen to those large complexes across the river? Mr. Lévesque has indicated that he wants to operate those buildings. There are four or five buildings in Place Campeau as it is commonly called, or Les Terrasses de la Chaudière. What will happen to those expenditures if there is a major change in the attitude of the provincial government and they decide to operate them?

An hon. Member: Roll them over.

Mr. Peters: I am not sure—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) has the floor. I suggest hon. members listen.