

*Financial Administration Act*

slack while giving private enterprise incentives and the confidence to expand.

Canadians' justified criticism of government spending, whether at the federal, provincial or municipal level, is against the multiplication of the bureaucracy without an apparent concomitant increase in productivity. The revolt is not against government programs; indeed there are continuing requests for programs. Canadians want to be assured that the programs are really efficient, effective and needed.

The appointment of a Comptroller General has been considered carefully by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) to ensure that the office will serve and meet our contemporary needs. Attitudes change in response to changing times.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) spoke of the increase in government spending of recent years as though it were a solely Canadian phenomenon. I have here an article from the *Economist* which traces the large growth in government spending over the past 40 years in all the rich countries of the world. It reads:

The 40 years during which the active pressure . . . created many muddles: a tendency in domestic affairs to try to resolve every problem by throwing taxpayers' money at it, a vague pacifism in international affairs so that the peace pledge union and its successors hampered prompt resistance to Nazi and then Soviet domination of too much of the world. Those 40 years . . . also brought some great human and technical advances, which are in danger of being too much disparaged now: A Keynesianism that has helped to multiply real gross world product five times over since the 1930s in history's greatest economic expansion, the building of decent and compassionate welfare states, the end of colonialism.

In our times we do not have this kind of very rapidly growing economy. We are more cautious about our expenditures on social programs. I am convinced the idealism, the commitment to social betterment, is as strong in Canadians as it ever was; but in order to pay for the progressive programs, we want our economy handled in an extremely efficient manner. For this reason the new appointment makes sense today and receives general support in a way it would not have ten or 15 years ago.

I think the government is to be complimented on making this new appointment and on the care with which the President of the Treasury Board has attempted to see this position slotted in with the other controls. I am sure that all members of the House will join me in wishing the gentleman who has been appointed all the best as he takes on this new and important appointment in our contemporary world.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Patterson:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have had a long day and it is now close to ten o'clock, may I call it ten o'clock?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is it agreed that we call it ten o'clock?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Miss Nicholson.]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

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

### BILINGUALISM—SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT CEASE SUBSIDIZING LA FÉDÉRATION DES FRANCOPHONES HORS-QUÉBEC

**Mr. Jean-R. Roy (Timmins):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my contribution reported in *Hansard* on page 3384, I have been wondering for quite some time why La Fédération des Francophones hors-Québec is using such verbal violence and confrontation with the federal government. I wonder why that non-representative and undemocratic body insists on attacking the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the federal government. After all, there has been really remarkable progress among French-speaking minorities since 1968, and certainly it is not the work of the PQ government, which was elected in 1976 only, nor the FFHQ. If progress has been made, it is thanks to Prime Minister Trudeau and his government. Confusing the federal government with provincial governments under the same criticisms is dishonest, it attempts at creating the impression that since 1968 the federal government has been doing nothing more for French rights than the provinces of Alberta or British Columbia for instance. This is most dishonest.

That the first ministers conveniently fell into the trap laid by Mr. Lévesque during the provincial conference in Montreal is one thing. Rather than risking their political skins, rather than showing the necessary courage and leadership, they preferred to fall for that. But equating Prime Minister Trudeau and his government with them is another, malicious story. Certainly, the PQ government do not have the responsibility, thank God, nor the capability to protect Francophone minorities, and I would remind the FFHQ that we are not Francophones outside Quebec, but rather French Canadians at home here in Ontario and Canada. The rights we enjoy are Canadian rights rather than extended Quebec rights. I would remind them it is the government of the province of Quebec that turned down the constitutional formula, and the national government that proposed to enshrine language rights into the Constitution. And this was not vetoed by other provinces, but Quebec. Therefore, I wonder why the FFHQ is launching that malicious campaign against the Prime Minister and this government.

Mr. Speaker, we had the answer last week. The FFHQ's hidden and dishonest objectives are aimed, not at protecting French-speaking minorities, but supporting the independence-seeking views of the PQ government and, through that, to sell out French-speaking minorities they claim to protect. Because once Quebec had separated, how could we justify the rights of French-speaking minorities? That hidden, devious and subver-