

*Supply—Mr. Dinsdale*

I am sure we are all aware that on any motion to go into supply every member has a basic right, as a member of a democratic parliament, to express grievances as he understands them on behalf of the constituency he represents, and also on behalf of the broader interests of Canada as a whole. Certainly there are plenty of grievances that can be brought to the attention of this administration. We are meeting following a long recess to put together the scattered events which have occurred during that period.

• (7:50 p.m.)

Then again as was mentioned many times during the course of the unnecessary election campaign last fall, we are confronted with an accident prone government—which I think is the euphemistic way of describing a government that has been somewhat erratic and confused in the administration of the affairs of this nation. The very method that was used to disrupt the events of parliament last fall is indicative of this fact. Just when we were all preparing to return to parliament, in September last, to continue our deliberations, we were thrust into the unnecessary election campaign, with the result that events have accumulated, and problems have grown apace.

We now find ourselves in the position where we must deal with estimates which concern a fiscal year that is almost past. As we review the events which have taken place in this house, just in the short time parliament has been sitting, I think we have to agree that the same accusations that could be made against the administration in the last parliament prevail again. This has been demonstrated in the situation that has developed with respect to the much vaunted formula of co-operative federalism, and the discussions which have arisen in the house involving the mishandling of the Spencer case, when this parliament is hardly one week old.

I think the essential problem the administration faces, and I am speaking here as a member of parliament among colleagues who are all equal in this house, is the fact that to far too great an extent the Liberal government has depended upon bureaucratic influence for administering the affairs of this nation. Any democracy requires a highly trained and skilled bureaucratic body to carry on the permanent basis for that democracy. The difficulty arises when we find politicians, or those charged with the responsibilities

of carrying power in a nation, using the backdoor method of bringing bureaucrats into positions of political responsibility.

Experts are fine in their place. In one of many definitions of experts they are defined as people who know more and more about less and less. That is a definition that is popularly used, and of course refers to the fact that in an industrialized and urbanized society which is becoming increasingly complex, we must have men and women in an advisory capacity who are thoroughly familiar with certain aspects of a complex economic and social situation. However, when these experts are translated into the seats of political authority by means of the back door technique of finding safe constituencies in various parts of the nation, and when they come immediately to positions of power on the treasury benches, then it is inevitable that such an administration or such a government should get out of touch with the fundamental wishes of the people.

I think that this was one of the main things evidenced in the election last fall. If there had been politicians in charge of administering affairs of the country, an election would never have been called. It amazed me, as an old politician of some 14 years experience in this house, that after a great travail of soul, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) finally made the decision to precipitate this country into an election. That is one evidence, I think, that the influence of bureaucrats trying to act as politicians is too strong in the affairs of the nation.

Another indication, of course, is the tendency of those with intensive rather than extensive expertise to resort to the techniques of hidden persuasion. Vance Packard has done a lot of research into this field, and points out how, by using the knowledge that has been accumulated by modern psychologists, it is possible to brainwash great numbers of people, even in a democratic society. This is the work of the man in the grey flannel suit, the public relations expert which is characterized by what I term sloganeering. This government, of course, has been a past-master at slogans, some of which have had the effect of persuading large numbers of people, particularly those who live in urban communities, to vote for them. People in urban communities are exposed to the intensive campaigns that are possible by reason of the mass media of communication which, by continuous repetition of slogans such as: "Let us get the country going again" or "War on