

The Address—Mr. Ellis

member seemed to be alibiing his acceptance of the party opposite.

We had a revelation today by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) of more and more dishonest acts being condoned by the government. By alibiing himself, he accepts the fact that we have fantastically high unemployment in this country. We have an unemployment insurance program that is costing us ten times that of the United States.

I take a great deal of delight in speaking of the personal pleasure I had listening to Her Majesty deliver the Speech from the Throne. I, and I am sure a number of others, made a silent apology to Her Majesty for having to deliver the drivel that she did. As always, however, she was most gracious. It was a distinct pleasure for all in this House to have her here to lend her dignity to the opening of the House. We all enjoyed a few moments with her later.

There is a range of subjects covered in the Speech from the Throne. I will be either the last or second last speaker from this side in this debate. The range of subjects is very broad. One could spend a good deal of time on any one of them. My colleagues spent a good deal of time on these subjects.

For the first time we have had a budget speech thrown in with the throne speech. Whether the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) is prepared to call it a budget speech or not, that is what it was, complete with ways and means motions to back it up.

From time to time we on this side have been accused of preaching gloom and doom. I know of no member of the opposition who is preaching gloom and doom. There is a problem, and we have to tell it like it is. We have to tell Canadians the facts because they certainly are not getting them from the propaganda of the ministers of the Crown.

Canadians support governments with their hard-earned taxes. Canadians fought, suffered, and died in the wars. As we come closer to November 11, we remember them more fully than we sometimes do. Those who sacrificed for their country deserve to know the truth. Should only a select group of Canadians, chosen arbitrarily, have the kind of knowledge necessary to protect their future and that of their families? Actions of some of these are some of the things I want to comment on last in my portion of this Speech.

I draw Your Honour's attention, and this has been mentioned before, to the words of the Auditor General in 1975 when he said, and I quote:

The present state of the financial management and control systems of departments and agencies of the Government of Canada is significantly below acceptable standards of quality and effectiveness.

In 1976 he said:

I am deeply concerned that parliament—and indeed the government—has lost, or is close to losing, effective control of the public purse.

On the way by in one of his reports he said, and I quote:

In the majority of the Crown corporations audited by the Auditor General, financial management and control is weak and ineffective. Moreover, co-ordination and guidance by central government agencies of financial management and control practices in these Crown corporations are virtually non-existent.

● (1602)

These two reports by the Auditor General contain page after page of evidence of this lack of management control. None of these decisions were made by members of this parliament. They were made, by and large, by a bureaucracy. My hon. friend from Battle River (Mr. Malone), my hon. friend from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) and others have drawn attention to the fact that the total budget when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came to power amounted to something like \$9 billion and that today the deficit alone is about \$9 billion. My hon. friend from Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) made a particularly telling contribution on the subject of foreign affairs, and my hon. friend from Ottawa-Carleton (Mrs. Pigott) made an excellent speech on behalf of disabled people. All these things are important, but the point I want to make is that we face a financial problem. It is not preaching doom and gloom to say we shall inevitably reach a point in time at which the taxpayers' ability to sustain the load of unlimited government largesse finally gives way. We are moving toward that point in time at breakneck speed. There is a danger of democracy smothering to death under a mountain of government debt, regulation, and red tape.

Once in a while I hear a voice raised in the House of Commons, other than from the opposition side, agreeing that there is a problem. He may not appreciate my drawing attention to it, but a colleague on the other side, the hon. member for Ottawa-West (Mr. Francis), frequently draws attention to some of the government's deficiencies though I suspect he is not heeded. Columnists make these points, too. One of them in an article I read recently says:

Relationships which were simple are made complex. Rules which everyone could understand are multiplied into abstractions and interpretations and footnotes to sub-sub-paragraphs until they are incomprehensible to everybody.

He goes on to say:

When the growth of a bureaucracy passes beyond control, it becomes a law unto itself. The process is self-fulfilling. The failure of each new intrusion compels it to intrude again. More people are hired, more programs devised to occupy them.

This particular columnist writes for the *Business Journal* and is preaching to the converted.

My leader made the point recently that when elected—I do not use the word "if"—he will implement what he has termed a sunset law to make Crown corporations justify their existence. I agree with that approach and I hope he will do the same with respect to projects in all departments. As a sitting member of parliament I experience a feeling of impotence from time to time in the face of some of these tremendous problems, but I know that through our efforts as a party these things can be changed. And, as my hon. friend from St. John's West said the other day in his eloquent speech, when we take over, they will be changed.

A few words, now, on the subject of the need for an ombudsman. The hon. member for Hochelaga took pains to tell us how necessary an ombudsman is. I say, not at all. There should be no need for an ombudsman. It may be that under the present government one is needed, but he should not be