

Supply

decades ago, we should look at the calamity this is creating, particularly for our youth. We have to ask ourselves how this can be rectified. How can the potential of our age be fulfilled? The point has to be made that if we begin to fulfil that potential, it has to be among the young people. To resolve the dilemmas of our present economic and social system we should begin to utilize the energy and the ingenuity of our youth. Canada is a well educated nation. We have to utilize our potential. This is surely the challenge that we as Members of Parliament from all political Parties must face.

I think that in many ways the debate has been a non-partisan one. There is much to blame the Government for, but the problem goes deeper than just different political philosophies. The problem goes to the root of what is the purpose of life in this new coming age.

This is the beginning of the debate. It is a debate that we should have in this House on many more occasions. I look forward to opportunities to participate in these debates and to add my suggestions and the suggestions of my colleagues in the hope that solutions can be found before it is too late.

Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon two charges have been levied against the Government. The first is that the Government is unaware of the extent and the nature of the problem of youth unemployment. The second, besides this lack of awareness, is that we have done very little or nothing to respond to the problem in an effort to solve it.

I would like to demolish the first argument by saying that I doubt there is any Government or any politician in the western world who is not aware of this problem. I was delighted to hear the remarks of the last speaker which stand in contrast to the remarks of the speaker of this Party who initiated the debate. The Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) said that this is really a non-partisan issue. He is absolutely right. This problem is so fundamental and the solution to it is so important that I believe it should stand above partisan politics, both in the House and in other institutions.

The second charge, that the Government has done nothing about the problem, is a charge I hear frequently from Members of the NDP. I heard it in my riding several months ago. I shared a platform with a Member of the New Democratic Party who told the audience that the Government had done nothing.

In reply I asked him what he would like us to do. He said that he thought we should put together a package of programs to retrain kids, counsel and direct them. I asked him what else he would like us to do and how much money he would spend on those programs. He told me \$1 billion at least. I told him that is what we have done already. The National Training Act, which was proclaimed in 1982, did exactly that. It will spend close to \$1 billion in retraining, counselling and directing youths. All the things the Opposition want us to do have been done. To supplement that program there will be money spent on the Skills Growth Fund, on the COPS Program and the various programs enunciated in the budget.

This afternoon I went through the budget of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the provisions it has for youth unemployment. I counted up in excess of half a billion dollars worth of programs being directed toward youth. I imagine a lot of Members of the Opposition might say, "Well, \$1.5 billion is a lot of money." But in the context of this problem it is not enough. These things only constitute ad hoc band-aid programs. But I would argue that any Government must respond with the tools that it has at its disposal. It does not matter whether the Government is a Liberal Government, a Social Credit Government, a Progressive Conservative Government, or a NDP Government. You always respond to the problem with the tools at hand. Frankly, I think any person who wants to be fair and reasonable in his judgment of the Government's response to this problem would have to conclude that this Government, using the tools and the limited resources it has at its disposal, has responded extremely well. I think it should get high marks from every fair critic for its response.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being six o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 62(11), the proceedings on the motion have expired.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

BILINGUALISM—KATIMAVIK PROGRAM—REFUSAL TO HIRE ANGLOPHONE

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I sought this opportunity to clarify some points raised through a question in the House of Commons on April 25, at which time I asked the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal) to explain why a constituent in Peterborough by the name of Geoffrey Webb was denied employment with Katimavik, a national program, because he was not bilingual. Mr. Webb took the opportunity to draw to my attention that he answered an advertisement which appeared in a Toronto newspaper. The advertisement indicated that Katimavik was seeking group leaders to work in the Toronto area. One qualification to become a group leader with Katimavik was that the applicant must indicate his willingness to become bilingual. I suggest that nowhere in the ad—and I will submit it for the record—does a statement appear which indicates that in order to apply one must be bilingual.

Mr. Webb received a reply from the Katimavik Human Resource Manager of the Ontario Regional Office, Chapel Street, Ottawa, Ontario, which very specifically indicated in