

*Export Development Act*

professional commentators in the economic world who have assessed Government spending. I start with one of the leaders from Quebec, an ex-president of the Economic Council of Canada, Mr. André Raynauld, who also had a later vocation a Liberal MNA in Quebec before he resigned or did not re-offer, and then became a Professor of Economics at the University of Montreal. Not only is he a well respected Quebecer, but he is also a well respected Canadian in every capacity, except sometimes concerning his political coloration, but that is always open to proselytization. With a man of his intellect, his mind, I am sure he will join those hundreds of thousands of others in Quebec and come on board so that they can be there after the next election and enjoy a responsible Government doing responsible things.

● (1210)

Before getting carried away with rhetoric, I want to quote what Mr. Raynauld, the ex-president of the Economic Council from 1972 to 1976, said in commenting on the EDC. He said that it is "rapidly becoming a bureaucratic monster, borrowing and lending money, making unsound loans to foreign countries, extending its empire and involving Canada in transactions and negotiations that are both costly and inefficient". That was said before the Bill even came onto the floor of the House. What would he say today? Your Honour has heard other Hon. Members mentioning what the Auditor General, who is no great partisan of this Party and who, in effect, is a servant of the House of Commons, said seven years ago with respect to Crown corporations.

My friend the Hon. Member for St. John's East has spoken of the expansion of Crown corporations. My friend the Hon. Member for Capilano spoke of the subterranean government of Crown corporations and its massive expenditure. What my friends did not mention is that when one speaks of Crown corporations, and not just the amount of expansion from 1962 to today, one finds the ridiculous situation that there are now actually 263,000 employees in Crown corporations today as compared to only 239,000 in all federal departments excluding Defence. There are actually more people employed in the Crown corporations of the land than in the federal departments of the land. That is how they have expanded, yet seven years ago the Auditor General said that "in the majority of Crown corporations audited financial control and management is weak and ineffective".

Four years ago the Lambert Report, which was supposed to deal with fiscal responsibility, stated that "existing provisions for classifying Crown agencies and for accountability for each category have been rendered obsolete". Just last fall, the Auditor General said:

—the growing practice of using Crown owned corporations to conduct the widening range of Government activities has so strained the capability of the existing accountability framework that Parliament may not be able to exercise its fundamental responsibility for overseeing receipts and expenditures of public funds.

In its report entitled "Intervention and Efficiency"—we have spoken of the massive intervention of the Government—the Economic Council stated:

Canada is perhaps the country with the least private sector participation in export financing decisions. In most of the 17 nations studied, the negotiations for granting export credit are left to the private sector. This is not the case in Canada.

Having just given those quotes from no one in this Parliament who may be partisan and wearing a political stripe, but rather from independent commentators, starting with André Raynauld, it is clear why we have expressed and will continue to express concern over the fact that Crown corporations and their fiscal accountability and responsibility to this Parliament are running rampant.

Surely the Members of the House, certainly we on this side, have received a message from the people out there. I hope, and I cannot hope too much, that Members on the Government side will also start to get the message from the people of Canada. They can call it what they will, they can call it anything in the Gallup Poll, but the one basic lesson I think the people of Canada are telling politicians, particularly federal politicians, is that they have had it up to here—and by "here" I mean up the neck, up to the gorge—with a Government that is spending taxpayers' money, thinking it can spend money better than people can spend it themselves.

We must redress that situation in the House of Commons. The original historic purpose of the House, indeed its only reason for existence, involved the battle of the purse, the power of the purse. The barons and lords came together on the common green and tried to check the authority of the King. That is the history of this place. Unless Hon. Members start to pay attention to history, then I can tell the House that in the future history after the next election there will be an awful lot of Hon. Members, good friends of mine, who will not be around to worry about division bells.

**Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on these particular amendments, I am reminded of a few comments by a new Member, one who has just taken his seat in the House of Commons in the last few days. The new Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain), in reflecting on part of his life, said to the press: "The harder you work, the luckier you are".

I thought about those words because they are ones upon which we and perhaps the Government should dwell. I was struck by those words because throughout this country there are countless numbers of citizens, taxpayers, who have diligently applied themselves and attempted to make a success of their lives, only to be frustrated by a Government that zeros in on any initiative that they may have shown.

People often speak to me personally about the problems National Revenue raises with them, because the Government is constantly in need of raising money. They frequently tell me that some of the expense accounts that they present are rejected and decisions are rendered whereby it would appear that in order to gain some redress to their grievances appeals must be made. In many instances it is not sufficient to embark on a costly appeal. This is an annoying factor with so many citizens who must produce the revenue that the Government must have if it is to carry on.