

say that I never remember his calling into question specific projects that he thought should not be proceeded with. He may have sent a letter indicating this to the Secretary of State and not sent me a copy. This is the kind of thing I am talking about, and it is what worries me about some of the charges that have been mooted.

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) referred to the project at Prince George. The hon. member knows perfectly well that that project has been cancelled and I am rather surprised that he has resurrected it at this stage several days later. Although he may not have been aware of this, the matter was mentioned in the House; and it was also mentioned by the House Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Baldwin) as his achievement on national television. Therefore, I am rather surprised that even now the hon. member is talking in those terms.

So I suggest that what we are confronted with here today is this form of blanket charge, and I am wondering what are the motives behind it. I do not want to impute motives, but what might have been some of the thinking behind this? It seems to me, without being overly severe, that there is a certain measure of politics involved in what we are dealing with today.

Mr. Crouse: In no way.

Mr. Faulkner: I do not want to be unfair.

Mr. Paproski: That is being unfair.

Mr. Faulkner: It seems strangely to smack of the old and discredited type of politics that I thought we had long overcome in this House. Because what appears to be happening is that these projects are being attacked on the basis that if you can get at these projects you are really getting at the government. I suggest that perhaps the sacrificial lamb in this whole process will prove to be not the government—because the government will not rise or fall on the success of a particular program, despite the fondest hopes of the official opposition—

Mr. Paproski: It is the one million votes you are after at the next election.

Mr. Faulkner: But perhaps it will be this particular program that may rise or fall in face of the type of concerted attack that has been levelled against it.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Paproski: Just like Pelletier.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Egmont is seeking the floor.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could assist the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member for Egmont indicate to the Chair why he is seeking the floor?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, could I raise the tone of the debate by asking the parliamentary secretary a question on a specific matter of great importance?

Opportunities for Youth Program

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member may ask a question if the parliamentary secretary is prepared to answer it.

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to answer a question when I am through. I am not going to take up too much time because other hon. members who want to support the program are waiting to speak.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is about a specific matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, without trying to—

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Does the parliamentary secretary not want to answer my question?

Mr. Faulkner: I can only judge from the sensitivity of the hon. member for Egmont that perhaps I have come reasonably close to the truth. He is showing more agitation now than when he made his earlier address. I would say to the hon. member for Egmont, and to those who at the beginning expressed support for this program, that they should start to sort out their priorities. If they still feel that the principle of the program is sound and that there is a role in Canada for an Opportunities for Youth program, and if they really believe that the federal government has a rôle to play in advancing these kinds of projects which are conceived, administered and finally evaluated by our young people, then they are making a grave mistake, I think, by playing politics with this issue and not supporting it, despite the differences. The difficulties we can deal with.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I rise on a question of privilege Mr. Speaker. I very much take issue with the affront of the parliamentary secretary in misinterpreting the remarks I made today as being in any way associated with the playing of politics.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Egmont may not agree with the parliamentary secretary, but it is a matter of debate.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to state my question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member for Egmont feels the Chair is not seized of his question of privilege, the Chair will allow him to present it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make very clear that the whole program concerning employment for students is much too important for me or anyone else on this side of the House to play politics with