

*House of Commons Act*

effort that goes into earning a taxpayer's dollar. A dollar of savings is so expensive and so precious that it cannot be risked in any equity. We have to go to Hong Kong or Switzerland or other places where there is less oppressive taxation. That is where we must borrow the money that the private sector needs to take a risk in the marketplace.

The Government is out of control. I am not going to speak just of the Government; the whole system, Government and the bureaucracy, is out of control. I have to ask who controls the bureaucracy. If the Government is going to stay in power it is not going to risk any attack on a bureaucracy or a correction of it. Where is anyone going to bite the bullet? Indeed, is it possible to bite the bullet in our type of political system so that care and common sense can be put back in the Government when dealing with the wealth-creating sectors of the country?

I stand here totally frustrated, Mr. Speaker. I say to you and to the Member who presented the Bill that that is the kettle that is boiling. If there is frustration in the hearts and minds of some of us here, then I want to tell you that there is anger in the land because this place does not function properly. If we are not doing our jobs as Members, then the kettle is boiling. The reason I stay, the reason I work here and the reason I do not play too much around here is that I am afraid that the kettle is boiling over. We are threatening the survival of a social system that requires the tender loving care of the wealth we produce in order for it to survive. That is what is at stake.

When we do improper things—with the Crow Bill, for instance—when we do not figure out the spin-off effects on future generations so that they can pay for our extravagance, then the country is in very serious trouble. What we are talking about is accountability and control. I have to blame each and every one of us here for that. I do not think there are 30 Members of the House of Commons who are prepared to man the four accountability committees recommended by the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. We must try to pull the knot of accountability back to the House of Commons, away from the Government and away from the bureaucracy. I do not think there is a will to do that. A few of us are breaking our hearts trying to, but there is no will to haul it back in here or to train and discipline ourselves to ask the questions that expose things.

I have to live with the ghost of James Macdonell Mr. Speaker. When I was Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, he and I spent hours and hours together. I happened to be present when the new Auditor General's Bill was allowed through by the late Robert Andras, then President of the Treasury Board. Following that, he allowed the Comptroller General's Bill to go through and then we put in place a marvellous new acronym called IMPAC—improved in management practices and control. We have had Auditor General's Report after Auditor General's Report since 1976, and all dealt with accountability and control of the public purse. But the situation today is worse than it was in 1974 when James Macdonell started his work. It is absolutely out of control. There is no one in the House of Commons who is prepared to

get to work, to bite the bullet and bring it under control for the sake of the freedom of our kids tomorrow.

● (1640)

That is the issue and that is what this kind of Bill addresses. That is why I would like to see the subject matter of this Bill discussed in committee, so we could bring something about.

Having complimented the Hon. Member, I must say I differ with him in respect of the fact he is worried about the powers of an Administrator. As an Hon. Member who has served on the Public Accounts Committee, I agree with the Administrator. I do not know why we are so secretive in the House of Commons about the tremendous amount of work which the present Speaker has done. I believe, when the whole story is known, that we are going to find that Madam Speaker has indeed been a marvellous manager and that she has put together the right division of responsibilities for the Table to function more effectively, for the Sergeant-at-Arms to function more effectively, and for the Administrator to function and organize the information in a manner in which all of us, with all our warts, pimples and acne, can understand.

I do not know why the Management and Members' Services Committee and the other committee want to keep some of the progress which is being made in the management of the House of Commons under wraps. If they were truly concerned about the need for a new form of estimates which organizes the information we need on all Departments, they would want the form of the estimates of the House of Commons widely published. I can tell you, Sir, that in the new form of estimates which are coming from the Treasury Board under the Comptroller General, the Part I is very good but the big Part II is the same old thing. It is organized in such a manner that a few Hon. Members with 26 years of experience can perhaps handle it. Then there is Part III of the estimates, and these volumes which are coming down from departments and various commissions are so well massaged, Sir, they are almost advertisements. They are not delivering anything, really, in a tangible, usable form to bring about a better accountability equation or effort on the part of Members of Parliament.

I asked the Administrator of the House of Commons some questions and he referred to a book and gave me answers, bang, bang, bang. I asked what the book was and found it was his form of the estimates for the House of Commons, which was organized in such a manner that if the Comptroller General of Canada used it for the organization of the estimates of all departments, if he just took what exists here in the House of Commons and used that over in his department, he would resolve the problem his departments are having with the new form of the estimates.

There might be some here, Mr. Speaker, who think that a departmental manual on Part III should be no thicker than a quarter of an inch. However, I want to tell you that the original concept was that it would be a fairly small book on a department, but it would grow much larger and would be organized in such a manner that those who want to inquire and ask questions and receive the public information which is