

was added to the deficit, not one dollar went into this department. Where is money needed the most if not in this department? This is the type of department which helps depressed areas. Something somewhere is all wrong. Today we are subsidizing the price of oil to the tune of \$10 million a day. Not one extra cent has gone to this department, but with the increase in the price of oil from \$35 a barrel to \$40 \$1 million a day was added. If some of that money had been put into the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, jobs might have been created.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) tells us there is enough incentive. I heard the Prime Minister tell us the other day that there is enough incentive because we have a \$14 billion deficit, but not one dollar was added to the budget of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. The Liberal party and the New Democratic Party said in the last election campaign that the previous administration had cut down funds. I can tell hon. members about community after community where I hardly got a vote because of that type of political campaigning. Yet the administration now sitting opposite will not allow one dollar to be added for the benefit of depressed areas, and they come out smelling like roses. The previous speaker, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley-Hants, said that because of inflation we have less money in real terms. It was interesting to listen to his comment on that score because, in a sense, he is right.

There might be a way around this. There will be a parade to the public trough. This is a growing thing. Our society just cannot seem to move without some kind of incentive. "Everybody else gets a grant, so therefore we are entitled to a grant". If that is the way we train the people, I suppose that is the way they will act. It is one thing to train the people that way, but when we have corporations and businesses operating that way, we are in real trouble.

While there might be a need for direct grants, I suggest that perhaps there is a greater need for capital at reduced interest rates. That will cause these corporations or operators to stop and think that perhaps they do not need that much of a grant. If they even have to pay interest at a reduced rate, it will cause them to think perhaps they do not require that much money. Therefore there will be a braking mechanism.

● (1530)

I have another idea. The federal government contributes, for example, 60 per cent of the funds to the province of Saskatchewan. The philosophy is that it is necessary to have a co-operative or a department of government operating something or other. They are operating everything as long as there is money coming from the federal government. They could not move up north without the federal government handing out money first.

In committee I suggest that there should be an audit, but I believe I used the wrong word. We do have audits, but they are after the fact to ensure the right amount of money was spent. We must have a monitoring system which oversees the operations being conducted, because there can be waste upon waste. In years to come in many instances funds will go into areas

Regional Development Incentives Act

which do not have the necessary technology, and are working with raw labour that is not trained in a particular field. Therefore they are bound to make a few errors, and a monitoring device will be necessary. If we enter into such a monitoring system, then there are always accusations that we are interfering with the provincial operation. So, how does one get around this problem? I do not see any other way. The taxpayers are entitled to get their money's worth.

I have received reports from my constituency on various operations. They asked what I can do about it. I cannot even go to the government or the minister to tell them about what is going on, because the operation is conducted by a provincial government. They have a line beyond which they cannot go. They are merely handed a bill, but they cannot say anything about how the money is being wasted in the operation. It is not too good to talk to them after the agreement has been signed. Originally everyone signs with good intention. Yes, they get together and plan. In fact the planning stage is great, and co-operation is great at both levels. The co-operation between the federal and provincial governments is great. The community is involved, and so on. Everything is go, go, go. However, once the agreement is signed, is in operation and is turned over to the provincial government, the federal government steps aside and says, "They know what is best; they can operate it."

What I am suggesting is that we require a monitoring system. It does not mean that the system will interfere with the operations of the provincial government. The monitoring system should not be conducted by the people who originally worked on the idea. It should be conducted by someone who is totally divorced from the idea. He or she can come in as an observer from another area, not knowing the people involved and perhaps not developing a close relationship. But he or she can report back to the minister who, in turn, simply identifies the areas where there seems to be waste. Then the minister can report back to the provincial authority. If they do not want to correct the situation, then we have a mechanism to make it public.

I am referring to the press and opposition political parties who are willing to make it public. The report should be public. It should not go to the minister so that he can put it under a table somewhere. It should be a public report. The monitoring system should be made public so that if the government does not get the message back to the provincial authorities, then the opposition will certainly do it. The opposition will play its role and expose it. Politicians being what they are do not like embarrassment any more than anyone else. I am sure provincial authorities do not like embarrassment either. That could be one method of getting around it. Without interfering with the provincial authorities, the political system could take over.

In many instances the NDP seem to draw a line at a certain point when they consider that it is too big. One can help organizations, companies, and groups of people, as long as one does not get big.

But I do not know at which point it become too big. Perhaps it is great to have big government, but one cannot have big organizations and so on. The NDP seem to draw the line. Some