

*Financial Administration Act*

because we have brought forward this bill. We have set up a Comptroller General who will see that the kind of spending the government has been associated with will be kept under rigid control from now on."

I do not believe that control will happen. As long as this government is in power, this situation will be parallel to that presented by the Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability. I quote a paragraph from their report:

Members of parliament with whom we have met have expressed additional concerns that centre primarily on the issue of accountability of the public service. Most agreed that the traditional doctrine of ministerial responsibility must somehow be adapted to the present size and complexity of the departments and agencies for which ministers—individually and collectively—are held to account. Equally, there is a consensus that information provided to parliament for its surveillance role is insufficient, often not pertinent, or unduly complicated. We have heard numerous suggestions for improving the procedures and mechanisms by which parliament could sift and digest the information it now receives. We have found particularly striking the testimony from those with the longest parliamentary experience that parliament's control of the purse is sound in theory, but seldom practised.

I suspect that will be equally true of the role of the Comptroller General of Canada. In theory it will seem as if this official will be able to keep an eye on the expenditures of the government. However, particularly in the past few weeks, the government has found with its usual ability surprisingly large sums to spend in various downtown cores across this country where a seat might be in danger. We find announcements of expenditures running into the millions of dollars being made at nominating conventions and by new candidates who hope they will be able to stave off the day.

This will not be enough to fool the Canadian people. To bring this measure in at this time, worthwhile as the idea may be, will not be enough. The Canadian people have come to realize that in order to get a public expenditure under control, there is only one solution, and that is to defeat this government and elect the official opposition to parliament in the election that cannot come too soon.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion, the nays have it.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On division.

[Mr. Johnston.]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost on division.

Motion (Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West)) (for Mr. Andre) negatived.

**Mr. Cullen (for Mr. Andras)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read a third time?

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** At the next sitting of the House. If there is unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I am sure it would be appropriate to call it ten o'clock.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that we call it ten o'clock?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

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

### INDIAN AFFAIRS—WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FROM NATIONAL INDIAN BROTHERHOOD

**Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, on one of those rare occasions when the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Faulkner) was in the House, I addressed a question to him and received the rather insulting reply that he was going to speak to me privately about the nature of my question. I am still waiting for some kind of overture from the minister to speak to me privately.

I asked the minister why it was that the joint cabinet-National Indian Brotherhood committee only had one area of agreement in response to a comprehensive set of proposals advanced by the National Indian Brotherhood. That one area of agreement is on the subject of land surrenders and that they shall in fact cease.

There are two basic reasons why the National Indian Brotherhood have in fact absented themselves from the cabinet-NIB committee. The first is the government's failure to recognize aboriginal treaty rights as a basic framework of serious negotiation. The second reason for the breakdown is the withdrawal of services that can only be considered by most Canadians as basic, essential and expected.

Services such as hot lunches for Indian schoolchildren have been withdrawn or cut back. Services such as fire protection on the reserve have been withdrawn or cut back. In that framework I would like to add a remark. In one example in the