

That being so, I submit that the government should implement some of the Auditor General's recommendations and some of the public accounts committee's recommendations. Certainly the government ought to take advice from those who are not politically implicated in its problems. We shall move from crisis to crisis as long as the government ignores the advice it receives and the storm warnings that must be evident.

We stumble from one crisis to another and each time the government says that if we do not support its program the consequences for the country will be dire. To get its own way the government has almost threatened parliament with blackmail. Much needs to be done and this party will co-operate to bring forward necessary measures. Yet somewhere along the line surely the government must show that it has a sense of responsibility.

The government must stop trying to put right something that has already happened and is in the past. In the financial world adjustments cannot be expected to take effect quickly; it takes a long time for some remedies to work. It is important for the government to use modern techniques in statistics. Here I am thinking of computers, data banks and that sort of thing. The government ought to use modern facilities to forecast the future. Certain future trends can now be predicted fairly accurately and by knowing what those trends will be the government may prevent difficulties such as we are now experiencing from reoccurring.

I wish to read from page 261 of the fourth annual review of the Economic Council of Canada, published in September, 1967. The report speaks of the waste in government and of the Parkinsonian build-up of bureaucracies as well as the lack of adequate procedures in administrative control. The report speaks of the care that must be taken to prevent overspending in government services, and it says:

However, this has not been matched by comparable advances in the development of procedures and machinery for dealing with much larger questions: for consistent and comprehensive determination of objectives and priorities; for continuing evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of the growing range and diversity of government programs in relation to their cost; and for increased co-ordination between governments in relation to these matters.

The members of the council say in their report that it is essential for the government to plan. They suggest that four questions about government programs ought to be asked, and for the sake of completeness I

Supply—Finance

shall put the four questions, found on page 263 of the report, on the record:

1. What are the purposes to be served by a given program of expenditures and is the given program the most effective way of serving these purposes?
2. Are the purposes or the anticipated results of any program inconsistent in some ways with the purposes and results from other programs, and how can such inconsistencies be eliminated?
3. What are the benefits in relation to the costs involved?
4. What are the effects on the whole economic system of different tax or expenditure changes, as these work themselves out over time under changing conditions?

It will be remembered that along these lines I asked the government to set up a committee. In December I suggested that a committee of the house might be set up but the Prime Minister suggested that it might be a committee of cabinet. I will not quarrel with that. If we are to achieve a more rational structure of government financing we must establish priorities for government spending and rationalize existing expenditures. We must plan future expenditures within the framework of these priorities and we must find an acceptable way of transferring revenue sources from one level of government to another. Also, we must reform the revenue sources.

The government's present dilemma has resulted from lack of planning. Planning should be made to serve priorities in fields such as housing, urban transportation, water supply and the disposal of domestic and industrial waste, air pollution and water and soil pollution, education and research and, to complete the list, social welfare.

What has been done in these fields? I shall describe shortly what the government has done. In the field of housing the government's attention has been totally inadequate. In urban transportation government action has been negligible. In the field of water supply and waste disposal government action has been non-existent. With regard to air pollution, so far the government has just talked. In education and research the government has made a halfhearted attempt. With regard to social welfare the best one can say is that under this government it is unplanned, ramshackle and jerry-built. We need priorities. We must have a criterion for judging priorities.

• (5:50 p.m.)

What are these priorities? To deal first with social necessities, we could ask ourselves: Is