

*The Address—Mr. Ellis*

needed. Many members of parliament, including myself, handle complaints which we receive from individuals in our constituencies who run into bureaucratic red tape. My staff and I handle multitudes of these cases. But we do not need an ombudsman. We need fewer programs, simpler programs. I go along with the venerable gentleman from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Venerable?

**Mr. Ellis:**—in saying there is a need to help those in our society who are in need of help. But, if we do not learn soon to get off the backs of the private businessman, we shall find ourselves in terrible trouble.

I have spent time as a private businessman. I recall sitting down with a partner of mine some years ago and finding out how serious it was that he and I, who had contributed tremendous amounts to a company, had a third partner who took more of the profits than either one of us. If there was a profit, I got 25 per cent, my partner got 25 per cent, and the government got 50 per cent. However, in years when there was a loss, I was responsible for 50 per cent of it, my partner was responsible for 50 per cent, and our silent partner did not contribute one confounded cent.

Our lives are almost totally ruled by bureaucratic decisions and opinions, all too often arbitrary, capricious, and uninformed. The bureaucracy which dominates the federal government today has actually become a measure of man's ability to govern himself in a time of tremendous technological change and population growth. It is so massive that it feeds on itself, so intricate that it lends itself to a wide range of abuses, some criminal and deliberate, others unwitting and inept. I mention, for example, the reactor deal with Argentina and the loss of many millions of dollars; we were never able to get to the bottom of that, despite the gallant efforts of my hon. friend from Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence). Then there is the affair of the uranium cartel. Eventually we may get to the bottom of that—we are being stonewalled constantly but we may eventually unravel what happened there.

Let me give the House one example of the kind of problem we encounter. It is not a very big thing, but there are many in this House who like to use private aircraft from time to time. A few years ago, as a private pilot—I am not one now—I was obliged to install an electronic locator transmitter on my aircraft. I recall arguing the matter with the transport minister of the day, asking him how safe these devices were and whether safeguards had been built into them. But they were forced upon us, and every private aircraft owner had to install an ELT in his plane at a cost of some \$200. It was the Department of National Defence which put pressure on the Department of Transport to make them compulsory. It was the Department of Communications which tested the ELTs and gave them a stamp of approval. It was the Department of Transport which provided legislation making the carrying of ELTs mandatory.

Owners had no choice but to obey the law. But now we find out that the ELT has not been performing as expected. Some

[Mr. Ellis.]

of them are potentially hazardous, and a bulletin has been put out telling owners they must be very careful of them. Incidentally, one of them exploded with tremendous force, damaging an aircraft.

I want to spend a few minutes now sharing with the minister and my colleagues some reading I came across recently, showing where some of our hard-earned tax dollars have been spent. From time to time we hear complaints that too much time and money are being spent on studies and that too many experts are being hired to take part in these exercises.

The book to which I have referred lists a number of the studies which are in progress. I quote, first, for \$1,920, an analysis of mixed office waste paper from government establishments in the Toronto area. Further down the page I find that for \$6,990 another analysis has been done of waste paper from government establishments in the Toronto area. Shortly after that I find yet another study on waste paper recycling opportunities for government action. This is to cost the taxpayers \$139,455.

● (1612)

Another one which I find quite amusing is described as an analysis of price elasticity of transportation fuels. Someone is spending \$29,800 to tell us that the price of transportation fuels is going to go up. Then for \$4,975 you can have research conducted into the psychological and motivational factors affecting new car purchase. I guess for that amount of money you cannot buy a new car any more so you might as well study the matter. For \$3,000 you can have design and analysis of data collection techniques for ascertaining social impacts related to variability of fishing seasons. Any fisherman will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot catch a pickerel with ice on the lakes which is too thick, and you should not catch them at other times of the year. For \$3,000 our government is looking into that matter.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) is going to spend \$53,976 on a study to develop and assess the cost effectiveness of practical implementable counter measures for pedestrian and bicycle safety in a realistic urban environment. For \$37,203 you can have a study and report on the inter-relationships between three elements of transit revenue collection, namely, fare policies, fare structure, and fare collection systems.

Here is one which is particularly delightful: for \$57,396 there is to be a survey of preferred bus stop spacing. I suppose they would recommend that the bus stops should be 40 feet apart if the buses were 50 feet long.

There are pages of these projects, Mr. Speaker, and this shows the way some of our money is being spent.

The size of the federal bureaucracy keeps on increasing year after year despite the unfair and growing burden it places on the taxpayer. It compounds confusion for the average citizen. If it continues, not only will business choke to death on red tape, but individual wage earners and property owners will suffocate under this centralized power. We ride monopolized and government regulated city transit, commuter railroads,