

*Financial Administration Act*

These figures are frightening. Yet these people who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, have the gall to call this restraint. We have been preaching this type of restraint, according to Charles Lynch, as reported in the *Gazette* of February 23, for the past five years, so there is no question of where the fault lies. Now we know why the Auditor General stated in his 1976 report that he was deeply concerned that parliament and, indeed, the government, have lost or are losing effective control of the public purse.

What do we see on page 1 of the summary of the 1978-79 expenditures? According to the minister of finance, for the 78-79 fiscal year the target ceiling for total spending is \$48,800 million. This, he states, would represent an increase of 9.8 per cent over projected total expenditures of \$44,450 million for 1977-78. Because of its magnitude, Mr. Speaker, because of its importance, and to emphasize my point, I wish to recap those figures. This government under the present Prime Minister was elected in 1968, ten years ago. In that year "How Your Tax Dollar is Spent" listed total spending for Canadians by the federal government at \$9,872 million. Now we are told, total spending—ten years later—will total \$48,800 million or, in round figures, \$39 billion more to service only an additional three million Canadians. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we have massive unemployment? Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we have horrendous inflation, plus a devalued dollar?

The financial insecurity brought about by the government's mismanagement of our economy has also brought us rates of crime, drug addiction, child abuse, violence, and sex perversion that are soaring to staggering levels. And as if this is not bad enough, we as Canadians must endure scandals in public affairs that make headlines every week. In these circumstances who should be surprised that our country is facing its most severe test of national unity in its 110 year history? The wonder is that other provinces as well as Quebec are not talking of leaving Confederation.

We must ask ourselves how this national tragedy happened when we are blessed with the second largest and richest land mass in the world. We are blessed with enormous resources in fresh water, minerals, forests, and arable land, with untold resources in and on three oceans. As well, our boundary to the south is protected by a powerful and friendly neighbour. The future is bleak, but our place in it is not entirely hopeless.

Present government spokesmen keep saying that our problems are largely due to general world conditions and that they have no remedy for this problem. This is a false doctrine. There is a great deal we can do about our future and our fate if our leaders have the courage to lead. Canada and Canadians can meet the challenge if we face up to reality. The road to national recovery may well be long and difficult, but the signposts now show the route very clearly.

Before this government can expect to command respect, it must first clean up its own act and make itself respectable both politically and economically and in its concept of public service. Members of the government must convince themselves and the nation that a united Canada is possible and worth

[Mr. Crouse.]

striving for. Supporters of this government, some of whom refused to stand in this Chamber when I rose and led in the singing of "God Save the Queen" on the anniversary of her Silver Jubilee, must learn that patriotism is not an obsolete and ridiculous word.

This government must learn and must recognize that it can no longer buy its way out of trouble by more borrowing. More spending cannot cure inflation. If we pump up the money supply only to fund what in some cases amounts to useless projects, we will simply have more inflation, more unemployment, and nothing else. This government must realize that this nation can only be held together by encouraging a unity of spirit within the public mind, not by confrontation, wise-cracking, threatening, posturing, or through compulsive legislation. Without respect in high places, there can only be contempt, discontent, and disunity. These are simply some of the reasons why we in Canada need a comptroller general. Our problems are primarily economic while this government tries to deal with them from a cultural and linguistic point of view.

● (1742)

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is insane to contemplate tearing our country apart simply because of pride of language or culture. The Prime Minister and Mr. Levesque, both of whom are cut from the same cloth, and came out of the same mould, must be made to realize, with the tragic examples before them of Ireland, Viet Nam, and Africa, that matters of culture, language, and religion cannot be enforced by oppressive legislation, or even by force of arms as has been suggested by the present Prime Minister, but can only be done by the desire of people to work together and live in tolerance, with mutual respect for each other.

The Prime Minister and Mr. Lévesque must learn that there are matters of greater human benefit and importance, not only in Canada but also in the world family of nations, than pride of language and emotional fervour over racial origins. These two men must learn that there are opportunities and there is plenty of room for everyone in Canada, except, I say to you, sir, political bigots.

International forecasts about the future of Canada are not very bright, and as a result of this there is a loss of confidence in Canada's future. Our dollar today is hovering around the 88-cent level vis-à-vis the American dollar. This is not due to a loss of confidence in Canada. I say to you, sir, it is due to a loss of confidence by the international financial community in the present Prime Minister and his colleagues.

These grim forecasts about our country going down the tube need not necessarily come true. I disagreed violently with the Prime Minister, for example, when he said on a CTV interview on December 28, 1975:

We haven't been able to make it work—the free market system—the government is going to have to take a larger role in running institutions. It means there is going to be not less authority in our lives but perhaps more.

This is not the way in which leadership must be provided to this country if we are to go forward. There are solutions to our problems, but it is up to us as a people to find and implement