

available would have it in a totally organized form, suitable for the average abilities of a Member of Parliament.

I do not stand as any academic, Sir. I am a very average guy, like most other Hon. Members here. That is why I am here. I am a commoner who is representing the people and the taxpayers. But by God, Sir, the kettle is boiling. If we do not get this new form of estimates finished, we fail; we threaten the system and the freedom of our kids tomorrow, because I do not know how they are going to pay for the extravagant spending which we have been guilty of in the ten years I have been here.

I compliment Madam Speaker for the job she has done and I will defend, as long as I am a Member here in the House of Commons, the quality of her work in organizing the information—which is public knowledge, in any case—in terms of running this place. If the Comptroller General will take the format which this House of Commons has under its Speaker and organize the information in all other departments in that form, it would be one giant leap ahead for the freedom and future of Canada.

That is why I stand here and make an appeal to Hon. Members on this important Bill. I believe it is a tragedy that we cannot get its subject matter to committee so that the matter could be discussed. I feel we need every opportunity we can get to discuss this subject of accountability and answerability in order to bring a runaway system back under control.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the comments of both the mover of the Bill, the Hon. Member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel), and the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). I believe the mover of the Bill expressed concern primarily about the operations of the House of Commons, much of which, I might say, has validity. The Hon. Member for Capilano extrapolated that argument into a discussion, perhaps a little beyond the Bill itself, but nevertheless an important one for the purposes of Members of Parliament.

I would like to say to the Hon. Member, however, that when he says he is just a very average guy, we do not agree with that.

Mr. Ellis: One above average.

Mr. Deans: I did not say that.

Mr. Ellis: I did.

Mr. Deans: I would like, however, to deal with the subject matter. To begin with, I would like to say there is no doubt that the House of Commons and certain of its emanations must be under the control of the Members of the House of Commons. The day to day operations of the House, the expenditures undertaken on behalf of the Members of the House of Commons, the provision of services to the Members of the House of Commons, the questions which arise as a result of providing access to the House by way of television and other media for the public, the question of the environs of the House of Commons, surely must be clearly dealt with and dealt with in a straightforward way by the Members of the

House of Commons Act

House themselves. For that reason, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the principle of Bill C-687 which was brought forward by the Hon. Member for Beauharnois-Salaberry.

I do have a little knowledge of a similar kind of situation which is in place at the moment in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario. The Hon. Member for Capilano may well be aware of this, but perhaps he is not. The Board of Internal Economy of the Province of Ontario Legislative Assembly is an all-party board which is made up of the representatives of the Crown, together with a representative of the caucus supporting the Government, a Member of the Official Opposition and a Member, in this case, of the New Democratic Party. They, together with the Speaker, comprise the Board of Internal Economy.

This started, I believe, in 1975, although it may have happened just prior to that. The experiment probably was viewed with some skepticism by Members of the Government who, up until that point of time, had complete control and total say over what happened in the general management of the Legislative Assembly of the Province. However, at the time the restructuring of the Legislative Assembly was before the Assembly itself, it was proposed by those of us on the Opposition side, and supported by the Government, that there ought to be Opposition Members there for balance. The House, after all, was made up of both the Government and the Opposition. We recognized that no government works efficiently without an effective opposition and no opposition works efficiently if it does not work in harmony with the House itself in an effort to try to find ways of dealing with public business.

● (1650)

Therefore, we made a judgement at that time which was quite simply that concern for the operations of the House—it goes beyond that and I will speak about that in a moment—and its environs was a concern of all Members. The responsibility for good and orderly operations, including good fiscal management, was the responsibility of all Members. It was not a Government responsibility and the Government need not accept unto itself all of the criticism which can be levelled in cases where there may, at least in the public's view, have been expenditures that were not easily understood or perhaps were unjustified. Those expenditures were taken on behalf of all Members. The provincial Legislature, recognizing that, proceeded to amend its proposal and in doing so included as part of the Board of Internal Economy, both, as I say, Members from outside Cabinet, including a representative of the Government caucus, if you will, outside of the Cabinet, and Members from the two Opposition Parties.

In addition to the sort of normal functions one might envisage, the Board had control over the expenditures of the Ombudsman inasmuch as he came before the Board and presented his estimates complete with his staff justification. The Board analysed it with the benefit of their administrative officers and took responsibility for its approval, just as a Minister would take responsibility for the approval of the estimates of his or her ministry. The Board of Internal Econo-