

Employment of Graduate Students

The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville has simply gone on to cite another area in which the government has failed. We contend that both the amendment and the subamendment follow logically upon the main thrust of the motion moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière. The main motion says that young people coming out of educational institutions cannot find jobs. The amendment says that is because of the government's economic and fiscal policies. The subamendment which we have moved says it is also because they have failed to carry out full employment policies and to establish a proper manpower program. It seems to me that both of these amendments follow in logical sequence from the main motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, there is a point I wish to clear up first very briefly. The hon. minister is putting words in my mouth; I never said that I was opposed to a higher education and the hon. members for York South (Mr. Lewis) and for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) pointed out that I actually never said so; I urge the minister to follow the debate more attentively. I simply said that the government had not created a number of jobs proportionate to the number of university graduates.

Now, as to the point you are raising, Mr. Speaker—

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. I do so to indicate to him that the House is now considering, for the assistance of the Chair, the point of order raised by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang). I think the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) could assist the Chair in that respect, but I would ask him please to direct his remarks to the point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, we feel this is rather a difficult problem for the Chair to settle. Indeed, it is never advisable to kill initiatives coming from either side of the House. A ruling on the opportunity of moving a subamendment on an allotted day, with regard to supply, is even less so. Every party has the opportunity of moving a censure motion followed by a vote on a topic it feels is fundamental.

That question makes the day allotted to the study of a Créditiste motion absolutely meaningless. We would be happy if your ruling helped to encourage parliamentary initiatives during supply. However, we wish to point out that we would not like this day to be anything but a Créditiste day. We want to take advantage of it to offer a Créditiste solution to problems which concern the House of Commons, but if the day is gnawed at by each and every party, it will defeat its purpose.

That is why I say that we will readily accept your decision. We will submit to it respectfully and we ask you to consider both sides of the problem. If each opposition party seizes the opportunity to gnaw at those allot-

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

ted days to make them into Conservative or NDP days, we might as well do away with them.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) has indicated his views, and I concede immediately that, in my opinion he has made a very good point. I can understand the concern of the hon. member and those in his party, that by the process of moving amendments and subamendments the points of argument that they wish to direct for the consideration of the House may be narrowed down.

I have listened to hon. members and I wish to thank them for their assistance to the Chair on the point of order raised by the minister. It seems to me, however, that the motion moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière, as the words that have been used in arguing the point of order indicate, has as its main thrust unemployment of young people and the steps the government might take in that regard.

That was followed by the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), which was accepted by the Chair. It followed, I think therefore, that it was consistent with the motion of the hon. member for Lotbinière.

I have some difficulty, I must say with great respect, in accepting the argument that the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is inconsistent in any respect that would give me any concern in relation to the motion and the amendment to that motion.

It seems to the Chair that hon. members in the House may have varying remedies, if I may use that word, and varying suggestions they may want to make to the government to correct a particular problem, and the thread of the problem is followed throughout, having been established in the main motion, and continued in the amendment and the subamendment.

So, having recognized the concern of the hon. member for Lotbinière, I would feel that speakers from his party would still have within the rather broad outlines that have been established, because the main thrust of the motion is of course the unemployment of youth and the various remedies that may be accepted, ample opportunity to deal with the subject of their motion.

Having said that, I do feel the amendment is in order, and if I may put it in a formal way now, it is moved by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period to a comma and by adding the following words thereto:

"and, in particular, has failed

- (1) to pursue policies of full employment, and
- (2) to amend the regulations governing manpower training and allowances so as to enable young Canadians leaving school and those who have been on the labour market for less than three years to receive a training allowance and training necessary to fit them for useful occupations."