

*Auditor General*

He goes on to discuss the political economy of liberty in a changing socio-economic climate, and then says:

The new liberty which we can hope and work for is a liberal response to a world which is in a process of radical transformation.

He then discusses some of the pressures on governments. I listed some of them, taking my list from another speech which he made. There is a problem facing democracy because of the desire for participation. Governments have asked for participation. We use phrases such as "participatory democracy". I have wondered why democracy needs such a qualifying adjective. Then, once the concept is in operation, governments are confronted with problems because it is difficult to take certain decisions, some of the conflicts participation arouses being incapable of satisfactory resolution, and the government can only act as a mediator or as a referee and thus leave some areas of participation frustrated.

● (2050)

Then *Dahrendorf* talks about the fact that political spaces are too small and insufficient to reach some of the problems. We have heard, from two or three of our colleagues who have taken part in this debate, suggestions as to ways and means of improving the mechanics of this institution.

Then he says international agencies are not designed to cope. We pay, I presume, more than lip service to many of these agencies, but the fact is that many of the agencies to which we belong, the World Health Organization, UNESCO and some others, are so politicized that what I might call neutral decisions, that is, decisions not based on politics, are impossible to make. The World Health Organization is just about to exclude Israel. UNESCO, in a very cynical mood last November, did the same thing to Israel. So there are serious problems with international agencies. Such agencies, for instance, have no way of coping with the harvest of the sea bed; there are no mechanics other than national ones to decide what is to be done in this field.

Then again, and we are daily witnesses to this, there is the extra-parliamentary power held by giant corporations and giant trade unions, neither of which seem very amenable, I regret to say, to the sovereignty of parliament. I am not indicting anyone; I am stating as a fact that the Port of Montreal is now closed despite a law of this parliament; I am reminding hon. members that despite the efforts of a responsible minister of the government the mails of Canada are in a chaotic state, I cite this as an example of the problems facing the democratic process and there seems to be no way of effectively controlling these extra-parliamentary forces—I was about to use the phrase "bring to heel" but I did not mean that in the sense of interfering with the rights of individuals. But I am rather old-fashioned, in the same way that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) claims to be an old-fashioned person. I have an old-fashioned view as to the sovereignty of this institution and I am deeply grieved when the public becomes cynical about it. I therefore welcome my hon. friend's resolution because it gives us a chance to say some of these things.

Part of the problem, too, is that many of us feel uncomfortable about telling the truth. I think of a couple of

[Mr. Fairweather.]

people who were not afraid to tell the truth. One was George Orwell, surely one of the great writers in the English language during the present century. He was not taken in by rhetoric even though he was a Democratic Socialist. When his party in the thirties turned its back on what was obviously happening in the Soviet Union, he told the truth. As a result, he was out of favour with the left. He told the truth, too, about what went on later in the authoritarian states—Mussolini's Italy, Hitler's Germany, and so on. This time he fell out of favour with those who in the late thirties cozied up to these dictators and were prepared to accept them.

These are days when it is well to examine our institutions and procedures and to think about openness in government. One of the senior people in the department of urban affairs had the temerity to discuss with the Indian people a policy decision affecting them. One would have thought the Russians were coming. The man was dismissed, although I notice recently, since those days, there has been a new wave in the department and the very issue for which that director was dismissed a year ago has become the in thing to discuss with the Indian people. I am willing and anxious to give the government credit for its turn-around, but the main thing here is that there should be an opportunity for openness. Nobody here would suggest for a moment that plans to house the Indian people of Canada have anything to do with the national security of the state.

It is my view that the only areas where governments are entitled to keep things secret are where the security of the state is involved, or the privacy of an individual in his dealings with the Crown, or the confidentiality of the Crown's dealings in connection with expropriations and so on. It is this propensity to secrecy which means that in so many instances we parliamentarians read in the newspapers from time to time that policies have been leaked. They are leaked because frustrated public servants are unable—presumably under the Thoreau doctrine of civil disobedience—to accept certain decisions or impending decisions; they feel there should be more public discussion.

I have never been able to accept the government's preoccupation with secrecy. I would have thought the AHOP incident would have shown to the ministry and to the executive that a little more openness, a little more consultation, a little more frankness, would lead to much more acceptance by the public of the issues involved.

The need for openness has been dealt with on many occasions. By curious coincidence, the Library of Parliament this very day sent members a useful check list of articles in leading publications dealing with some of these issues. I took the trouble to get several of them copied. I do not intend at this stage, when other members wish to speak, to load the record with them, but there is a series of articles which are worthy of attention, one, for instance, in the fall edition of *The Public Interest* by Daniel Bell, the prognosticator of the industrial revolution. His article discusses in a very apt metaphor, I think, "The Public Household—on 'Fiscal Sociology' and the Liberal Society." Might I be allowed to quote a few paragraphs because I think the analogy might find some acceptance on the part of ministers. Daniel Bell says: