

Interim Supply

the support it may give for any special programs for older people or unemployed workers, carried on in the facilities created by this act. I would like to ask the minister whether the government has anything in mind in that regard, or whether it intends to carry along with the policies that are in existence at the present time.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question for clarification. It is on the same line. According to what the minister just said, this amendment will bring a new scope to the bill, and I wonder whether it takes into consideration the fact that the province of Quebec might not recuperate the difference in the amount which Ontario has received under this scheme and which Quebec has declared she has not been able to receive. I think the minister understands my question. I think this was the complaint that may have caused the minister to discuss this new arrangement. I would like him to tell me what the discussions were and give his comments on this question.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of my hon. friend I would say that one of the purposes of this proposal that will be brought before the house later in the form of a resolution and then a bill is to make it possible, for example, for some provinces, including Quebec, to participate more fully in this program. The response among the provinces has been uneven and the purpose of this new formula is to make possible a more equitable participation. I talked about the per capita contribution. I should make it clear to members of the committee that I am talking about the federal contribution per capita in the age group 15 to 19; the average federal contribution per capita for Canada in this group up to date has been \$225, while in Quebec it has been \$51 and in Ontario \$458.

By taking the highest province, which is Newfoundland, and bringing all other provinces up to that level it will allow every province to more or less share equitably in the program. Mind you, once this level of \$480 is reached, the provinces will continue to receive the 50 per cent contribution. This only applies to the additional 25 per cent. I understand that the province of Quebec will accept this particular proposal. I cannot inform my hon. friend from Port Arthur definitely as to the attitude of the province of Ontario, but I will say that even under this proposal the province of Ontario stands to gain a further sum under the 75 per cent arrangement.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us how many people there are of

that age group in Ontario? I wonder whether the minister has those figures. It seems to me that on a rough calculation it would mean \$22 additional per student, if I have subtracted \$458 from 480 correctly. How many students or persons are there in Ontario in the age group 15 to 19 that the minister mentioned? Does he have that figure, or could he get it for us?

Mr. MacEachen: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I do not have that figure. However, I can assure my hon. friend that when this proposal comes before the house for definite action I will be able to give him all this information.

Mr. Smith: Am I right in assuming that it is an additional \$22 per student in Ontario within that age group, however many there are?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think this is correct.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask another question on this matter. What adjustment will be made as this program goes along for the fact that the per capita figure will be changing as we get the flood into the 15-19 age group? Is there any allowance made for that, or is the per capita formula based upon the number of students right at the present day.

Mr. MacEachen: My hon. friend has raised an interesting point. The per capita proposal is based on the 1961 census. It was not expected that we would make any adjustment to take into account this particular aspect, but I think it is something that is worth considering.

Mr. Fisher: What proposals have been put before the minister in terms of the continuing contribution of the federal government toward the upkeep of the vocational assistance program? Is there anything there at all?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is confined to capital construction assistance. In the resolution that is on the order paper my hon. friend will notice there is an additional federal contribution of training allowances for unemployed persons from 75 per cent to 90 per cent. Also the federal contribution will increase from 50 per cent to 75 per cent with regard to training costs in industry for employed persons. So there will be, in addition to this capital cost provision, additional federal assistance for training programs for the unemployed and the employed in industry.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, could the minister say whether any consideration has been