With regard to some of the industry programs the hon. member mentioned, and some other programs, my comment is that he cannot be serious when he suggests that when government has to intervene on the social side, it must not also intervene on the industry side to make sure, first of all, that industry becomes efficient, productive, follows the technology used in the world and is co-operative. Being an academic, I can only say that he might have a conflict of interest, because instead of industry he wants academicians to do the work. However, there is no question that the government must work closely with industry in research programs and with that kind of intervention.

● (1730)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave)—Grain—Suggested deferral for income tax purposes of interim payments; the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan)—Cape Breton Development Corporation—Request of United Mine Workers for investigation of management of corporation—Government position; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs—Prisoners of war—Date of implementation of recommendations of committee.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—GOVERNMENT SPENDING—IMPLEMENTATION OF WILSON REPORT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Stanfield:

That in the view of this House, the government should set an example to other Canadians by forthwith indicating the nature and extent of the restraints on government spending and should also introduce without further delay measures to implement the Wilson Report on the office of the Auditor General as an indication of its willingness to eliminate waste and extravagance.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this supply motion, especially the part which states that the government should "introduce without further delay measures to implement the Wilson Report on the office of the Auditor General as an indication of its willingness to eliminate waste and extravagance."

Before I deal with the main body of my speech, quite frankly I listened with some amazement and concern to

the speech made today by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) as he repeated over and over again that members of the Official Opposition never give him any concrete suggestions for curtailing expenditures, but keep asking him for more and more.

I do not wish to be overly repetitious in debate, but when speaking in the House on October 23, 1975, I gave in some detail a number of concrete proposals covering cuts in expenditures which, if implemented only in part, would cut back some half a billion dollars from government expenditures without basically affecting the lifestyle of Canadians.

Obviously the minister is not interested in receiving sincere, concrete proposals; rather, he can only list a group of expenditures, which he did today, which he claims cannot in any way be curtailed. I will ask him again to refer to page 8491 of *Hansard* for October 23, 1975, and at least give consideration to the proposals I made, which I hope will be helpful.

The credibility of the government is at stake, and its credibility is strained. There is no question in anyone's mind why this should be so. All one has to do is to look at the Ottawa *Journal* of October 29 to read that the cost of renovating the former LaSalle Academy on Sussex Drive as headquarters for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) doubled between January, 1973, and December, 1974, according to a Department of Public Works spokesman. The additional cost of restoring the historic building was estimated at $4.3 million. By December, 1974, Treasury Board had approved expenditures totalling $8.3 million.

Mr. Baldwin: Shocking.

Mr. Crouse: This type of expenditure, a mismanagement of government funds, puts us as Canadians in the position we are today.

The present powers of the Auditor General of Canada are derived from sections 56 through 65 of the Financial Administration Act. The office, of course, predates confederation. Numerous attempts have been made to draft new legislation in order to resolve the controversy between the previous Auditor General and the ministry. Some were prepared at the instigation of the then president of the treasury board, one was drafted by the Auditor General himself, and two had their origins in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. None of these drafts envisaged any change in the role of the Auditor General. Instead, all were largely concerned with housekeeping details.

A large number of the recommendations submitted by the Independent Review Committee can only be implemented by legislation or by some other form of executive action. In all of them, however, there is an underlying purpose, namely, to strengthen the office of the Auditor General of Canada, a purpose which the Public Accounts Committee must fully support.

There are some who would argue that strengthening the office of the Auditor General would provide a temporary improvement in the positions of political parties currently in opposition. However, I believe it would also ultimately strengthen the parliamentary system, and surely this