

them all a social insurance number or something. How can you be autonomous when everything you do is in the minister's back pocket or, worse than that, in the back pocket or the back of the mind of the local Liberal chairman? How autonomous can a port be when it is the minister who makes all of the decisions?

● (2150)

There are a number of small amendments we are going to move, Mr. Speaker. For example, we will move to change the wording "in the opinion of the minister" everywhere it appears. You have to have a reason, then make a judgment, and we will accept that. But it will not be in your opinion; it will be the opinion of the local Liberal hatchetman or appointer of great people. I accept the minister's argument about the difficulties of including the municipalities in the local port corporation because conflicts of interest will develop. But I will not support the minister's argument, for example, when it comes to whether or not he will extend to labour the right to recommend someone to the authorities. I can see the possibility of conflict when dealing with municipalities, but I cannot see it when you are dealing with the makeup of the local port corporation. How autonomous can the LPC be if the Canada ports corporation can determine which statutory powers it can give to the LPC as listed in the act? No rationale has to be given under the act. Worse, there is no legislative appeal built into the act. If an LPC wishes to contest a decision, how does it appeal and to whom? How autonomous will it be if it is unable to borrow or invest in the private marketplace? It would only be able to do so if the CPC, on its own presumably, changed its status from a schedule C to a schedule D Crown corporation under the Financial Administration Act. I do not know whether or not any of the ports would want to start that process. We have heard from some officials of government, not within the Department of Transport, that they are not all that enamoured of schedule D under this legislation until they themselves have had an opportunity to take a look at the provision of the Liberal government's down corporations proposals.

On February 28, 1982, during a CBC radio interview the Auditor General was asked why the government was proceeding so slowly on the Crown corporations bill, and this is what he said:

Well, it's a source of frustration for me because I think it's very important that we have Crown corporation legislation. I'm not exactly sure when the Crown corporation legislation started, but I know that when the new Auditor General Act came out in 1977, the parts of our legislation regarding Crown corporations was left a little loose because the Crown corporation legislation was expected shortly. Well, that was 1977. When the PC's were in power, they brought forth a paper that died when their government died. Subsequently to that, the present government has had a study paper on the topic of Crown corporations—I'm not exactly sure why that's not proceeding rapidly.

The Auditor General was then asked if he had seen this Liberal government paper on Crown corporations, and he replied:

### *Canada Ports Corporation Act*

No. I've been denied access to that paper. I think that's part of the—what I find rather strange political science notions in Ottawa. I don't know that it's necessarily a high level political decision. I suspect it's some bureaucrat who's accustomed to defending his rear.

Thus it seems the Auditor General is in somewhat the same predicament as members in this House. He has not seen it, nor have we, and it does not look as if we are going to see it. Not only is there lack of accountability in terms of the missing Crown corporations act, there is no mention at all of how we are going to audit. We asked for joint audit by the Auditor General of Canada and we did not get it. We are going to ask for it again, and I do so right now. I serve notice that we will move an amendment the effect of which will be to join the Auditor General either in joint audit or to extend to him the responsibility and right to audit these many Crown corporations. In the absence of a Crown corporations bill or any indication of what the government wants to do, what other choice do we have? Very little, I am afraid.

Furthermore, there is no legislative provision for the annual report of the CPC or those of the LPCs to be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport. We would ask for that. I have touched on the financial aspects of this legislation. We want the Treasury Board to release through the minister the financial limits to be set in the LPCs bylaws. We hope and trust, and knowing the minister we are certain, that once we see them they will be realistic and meet the requirements of 1982. We would like to see it before it reaches the committee stage, but at least let us see it at the committee stage. We want a good explanation of what excess moneys are and under what conditions the long arm will reach out and take money from Vancouver, Halifax, Montreal or Toronto. We want to know what will happen to that money. We want to know about the transfer of funds from LPCs to the parent corporation. We have been through the banking concept proposed by the minister in Bill C-92. When we look at Bill C-92, we realize that there is not a trace of the banking concept of transferring money back and forth between local port corporations and the central corporation. There is not one word indicating in fact how it will happen or under what guidelines. Why was it not spelled out? It was certainly in the notes of the minister and in everything he had to say about it. It was in the discussion paper, but it is not in the bill. We have asked for it to be placed in the bill.

● (2200)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.