

Canada, as perfected by the Liberal party, is the art of patronage and building and controlling a bureaucracy. The last decade has seen the use of these instruments of political power rise to the point where the rank and file Canadian can no longer contain his disgust for politicians and the system. Patronage does not serve the poor. It does not distribute wealth, as the Prime Minister loves to imply with his quote "From those with means to those with no means". Patronage redistributes wealth on a constituency basis, with the beneficiaries being the middle class. It ignores minorities.

The building and use of the bureaucracy as a root of political power in the last decade has now arrived at the point where its cost is overwhelming those responsible for the production of wealth. The increasing workload on members of parliament caused by civil servant buck-passing, indifference and, at times, sheer arrogance, is becoming truly alarming. This issue is not limited to the Canadian civil service. It seems to be a wide issue in the western world and is very well reported on in a book from the United Kingdom entitled "The Disobedient Civil Servant". So I say again that we are dealing with a phenomenon which is not limited to our own country but, nevertheless, one which must be addressed in a serious way in this House when we are debating the mismanagement of our resources.

We must ask whether parliament, which sits over this bureaucracy, can survive as a form of government capable of continuing to protect and serve man's freedom and man's quality of life. Can the member of parliament improve his performance and serve meaningfully a public which feels increasingly isolated? In the role of watchdog over supply, can the member of parliament accept the full role of a director elected to represent the shareholders of Canada? Our record is tragic, and the neglect of our overview and watchdog role with regard to the nation's tax resource is a disgrace.

The introduction of television into the House now delivers the challenge of these questions squarely onto the desks of members of this House. Can we react to the warnings of Solzhenitsyn and Norman Macrae of *The Economist* of London, England? I think we can. I think we have to move in a substantial way to improve the committee system of parliament if we are going to manage the tax resource properly.

I offer the following suggestions. First, the public accounts committee should be given a permanent director with the right to hire and/or call on research staff as required on particular subjects. The committee should be given a permanent committee room with office facilities adjacent. The committee should perhaps be reduced to 14 members or less with parliamentary secretary pay and status. The chairman should be from the opposition and should be given the proper status for his responsibilities. The function of the committee should be to conduct audits, and it should study and report on government-wide issues. Perhaps the committee's proceedings should also be televised.

Waste and Mismanagement

● (1650)

In addition, and parallel to that committee, I should like to suggest that there be put in place a permanent expenditure committee with a permanent director, a budget and the right to hire or call on research staff as problems require. It should be given a permanent meeting room and office facilities, perhaps adjacent to those suggested for the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. It should be made up of 14 members or less, members should have parliamentary secretary status and pay, and the chairman of that committee should also be an opposition member. Its function should be to examine and review the criteria supporting the spending process.

In view of the fact that we now have 400 Crown corporations, I think that a permanent Crown corporation committee should be set up with an act supporting the function of that committee. Its object should be to review the objectives and the use of resources by Crown corporations. Again a permanent director should be appointed with a budget to hire or draw on research staff as required for the subject matter at hand. Again these facilities should be co-ordinated with those suggested for the public accounts committee and the expenditure committee. The parliamentary secretary pay and status should also apply to members of that committee.

With these suggestions, if we could put a view on the spending process at the beginning and also at the end and examine the activities of Crown corporations which also have a spending capacity based on a public resource which creates a contingent liability, we could start to get the essentials of this process under control.

I should also like to draw the attention of members to *Votes and Proceedings* of Friday, March 23, and the substantive report which members of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts submitted to the House in their third report dealing with the reorganization of the form of the estimates, marrying that form to the public accounts so that we can have audit trails from a vote appropriation all the way through to the reporting of the fact in the public accounts. We are also calling for an informational system in the form of the estimates, a summary volume and other volumes to follow which would provide the detail within each department, opening up and removing once and for all this aura of secrecy which seems to prevail around a poorly presented wealth of information which has not been organized in the proper form. I would commend to hon. members a reading of that third report because I think it is one of the more important reports that that important committee has tabled in this House.

As I listened to the President of the Treasury Board I came to the conclusion that only self-worship or the narcissism of this Liberal government prevents their recognition of the malaise that faces our people and our form of government. They have had an opportunity to correct the system in the last decade and they have not. We have heard of the extent of their restraint program and I have figures to show the infinitesimal effort that has been made in light of the magnitude of the challenge that has faced the government. They have delivered a debt which future generations will have to carry and which