

our position when we as Members of Parliament, dealing with, as I suggest, relatively untrained civil servants, put the final seal of approval on those applications? I suggest to you that where we have applicants competing in the same field of endeavour, such as the tourist business or the manufacturing of certain types of sports and athletic equipment—and in a riding such as mine one can determine who they are—we as Members of Parliament, are placed in an untenable position. If we endorse the application of an applicant, and that application is successful, and we find out that that particular applicant and his employees support our Party politically, are we then subject to the charge that we have engaged in pork barrel politics? Since we are now putting a personal stamp of approval on these applications, if we turn an application down, are we to be subjected to doubts about our judgment because of the very close contact which the Government wants Members of Parliament to have with the applications?

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I want to address the question of helping businesses with a proven track record with these grants. I would not have as much difficulty with this question if we were lending them money. But we are granting them money, we are taking the taxpayers' money and giving it away under the Summer Canada Program and the Canada Works Program. I believe we would be doing a better job with the taxpayers' money if we were lending it. I would even be happy if we had a system of forgivable loans, whereby if a company said it was going to create 50 jobs and it received \$100,000, and at the end of the year 50 jobs were created and in place, the \$10,000 could be forgiven. At the end of the second year, another \$10,000 could be forgiven if the jobs were still in place. But I have very serious doubts that we do justice to the taxpayers when we give their money away.

To go one step further, what about the applicants who receive funding under these grants, who put this funding into fixed assets and then sell out? They build their buildings, which were going to house the employees for these new jobs, and once they have them built, they sell the buildings and they are on their way. There are no penalties, Mr. Speaker. These people have made a windfall profit on the backs of the Canadian taxpayers. There is no provision in these grants for second mortgages going back to the Government, nothing to hinder this from happening, and that is what I object to. Even if we are going to grant money—and I suggested earlier we should lend it—surely to goodness we should put a hold on the fixed and movable assets. In Ontario we would do it by a mortgage and personal property security lien. Surely we owe it to the Canadian taxpayers to protect them from people getting money under these grants, building the fixed asset, selling out, and then, first thing you know, moving to Florida. We have not done that, and that is what I object to.

● (1540)

I zeroed in on my particular area in my comments, Mr. Speaker, but I believe they apply to ridings all across the country. I want to say specifically that I am in no way reflecting on the civil servants I have dealt with in the Barrie office of Canada Manpower. I have had nothing but excellent

relationships with them when we came to discuss funding for non-profit organizations. My concerns are strictly with the entry of the Government *holus-bolus* into the granting process to profit-making organizations.

Supply

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch upon what I think this method of funding has done to the volunteer sector of our society. I think it is important to get this on the record. The policy of the Government has been to fund volunteer organizations for one or perhaps two years but no further. It does not want to get into long-term funding of volunteer organizations. However, over the past four or five years what has happened is that volunteer organizations have looked at the source of funding and said, "We have a program which will fit in; we want that funding and we are going to use it". They get the funding, use it for one or two years and then find that it disappears under the criteria. I suggest that this has worn out the welcome of a lot of these programs with the volunteer sector of our society. They have found they cannot continue without the funding. It takes a year or two to get the kinks out of a program and get it rolling, then the funding goes and they cannot continue. I suggest that if we are not at the point, we are very close to the point where the volunteer sector is going to be suspicious of these programs. I raise that flag of warning that we are doing a disservice to the voluntary sector.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I support wholeheartedly and have addressed my remarks to the first part of the NDP motion. I feel very strongly about the dangers we are facing with this type of program. I am on record with the Minister as saying I will not touch, look at, sign or have anything to do with grants to the corporate sector of my riding because of the danger I have outlined here. I continue to be very interested in making funding available to the volunteer sector, especially in my riding. I worked very hard to get funding for the Huronia Tourist Association, which has a program to house people connected with the Papal visit. I have done that, and I am fully in support of whatever we can do on a one-shot basis for these types of programs. However, I raised this question with the Auditor General. I suggested to him, in my capacity as Member of Parliament and in my capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and I suggest to you, that one or two years down the road the Auditor General will look at how many jobs were actually created compared with the number which the application said would be created by way of a grant or hand-out. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the jobs are just not there for the reasons I have outlined.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions, comments, debate. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, concerning the motion before the House today, we on the Government side should not be surprised at the fact that all kinds of