

*Supply*

there is less money available for post-secondary education. The list goes on.

During the time when these benefits and services to Canadians are being cut back significantly, the department that delivers them, instead of getting leaner and more efficient, is increasing its spending significantly.

Reform felt that in fairness to Canadians who were having to take less from this department that the least the department could do would be to operate on at least 5 per cent less money than it asked for from Parliament.

Unfortunately the modest decrease in operating funds of 5 per cent which we proposed was voted down by the Liberal majority on the committee and interestingly by the Bloc members on the committee. In committee the Bloc members did not support even a 5 per cent decrease in spending but in the House they want a \$1.3 billion decrease. We find that quite interesting.

• (1810)

Reform proposed a very realistic 5 per cent cut to operating expenditures. This would have been an important first step and one which the government could have and should have been able to live with.

Instead the government is pushing through the votes in the main estimates without even the kind of public scrutiny that we should be able to expect as Canadians from a massive spending program by government. These estimates are being put through without the members of Parliament who hold a majority being able to decrease that spending by even \$1.

Whatever government departments ask for, whatever the bureaucrats propose, is what they are being given. Is that any way to show accountability to Canadians? We were elected to oversee the spending of their money as carefully and prudently as possible. No. Whatever is put forward, we just put it through. We will see this later on today. There will be not one vote that will diminish the spending estimates put forward by government departments by even \$1. That is not accountability. It certainly does not hold the civil service accountable for the kind of spending they are supposed to be doing of Canadians' money.

This spending affects every Canadian from St. John's to Victoria. We should be looking very carefully at how that goes forward.

Even the Bloc motion on vote 10 that we are debating right now is being countered with a government motion to boost the spending in the area of grants and contributions right back up to where it started. This is in spite of all attempts to give the matter serious consideration.

The Reform Party in February released a budget which we believe the country should operate by. It was called the taxpayers budget. This budget was a direct result of input from our party members at the grassroots level right across the country. What ordinary Canadians were calling for and what was reflected in our budget were reductions to the bloated and inefficient programs, especially funding for special interest groups such as the ones that are funded under the motion we are debating at the moment.

Reformers spoke out loud and clear in this area of government money for special interest groups. We supported cuts in these particular areas and our support is solid.

Also in the taxpayers' budget Reformers were clear that areas of provincial jurisdiction, such as training programs, should not be intruded upon by the federal government. In that one area we agree with our friends from the Bloc and their opposition to some of these requisitions for money that really should not be allocated by the federal government but should be left to the provinces as the Constitution provides.

Many of the grants and contributions in this motion are dealing with services which are the responsibility of provinces. That should be acknowledged and respected.

The Reform plan consisted of a formula for dealing with grants and contributions depending on whether they were provided for businesses or special interest groups. We believe contributions to businesses should be cut on a formula of 100 per cent cuts and that the funding for special interest groups should also be cut 100 per cent. That is our formula.

Let us now look at some of the specific expenditures that are covered under this motion. Part III of the human resources main estimates breaks funding down with vague descriptions only, such as "grants to improve employability and to promote employment opportunities". These are broken down further into what the department calls partnerships. It calls for labour market adjustments—it is scary for the labour market to think that good old government is making adjustments on its behalf—and what the department calls community development projects.

Money from this area is supposedly to be used at the local level to create jobs. The problem is that the expenditure of this money often creates no real long term sustainable jobs at all. They create only artificial jobs or jobs that last only long enough to give an individual enough weeks of work to qualify for unemployment insurance, of course calling for more funding and more money from the government department that started them on this nice cycle in the first place.

• (1815)

These are the sorts of make work projects the government prides itself on, instead of allowing the private sector to energize our economy. This government acknowledges openly