

Mr. Gleave: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) for complimenting me on where I live. Let me point out that he happens to live in the same place.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: This is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. We are debating a serious piece of legislation which concerns the lending of money to younger people. The age is lowered from 21 to an unspecified age depending on the law in each province. The age may be 19 or 18. In fact, in most provinces it is 18. I am dealing with our amendment and the subject matter of the poor, weak and inept amendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia.

As to the idle remarks of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar who suggested that I live in the same apartment block as he does, I do not deny that. However, I live on the third floor, while he lives in the penthouse. Do I know what is going on in that apartment? I am not debating whether he sold his tractor or his farm. He knows what he sold. Furthermore, his constituents will know what he sold. They will know whether he has divorced himself from the land. If he will have a farm sale and call in an auctioneer, I would like to offer myself as auctioneer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has two or three minutes left, and I respectfully suggest that we return to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to the remarks you made when I drew your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre did not stick to the subject matter of the bill when he said that the wheat pools had been bought out by the private grain companies. Then he said I was not dealing with the subject matter of the bill and raised a point of order. In fact I was dealing with the bill. Then, Mr. Speaker, you said that we were both equal. To me this lends nothing to the debate. I do not want to cast reflections upon your ruling—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Crowfoot knows that when the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre raised his point of order, I ruled in favour of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre and indicated that generally speaking when hon. members were dealing with agricultural matters they were relating them to farm credit. When the hon. member for Crowfoot was speaking, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre raised a similar point of order and I then ruled in favour of the hon. member for Crowfoot. I think hon. members were in order, generally speaking. It is a very wide-ranging debate.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

25316—11

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

MANPOWER—LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—FUNDS ALLOCATED, AMOUNTS SPENT, APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY PROVINCES

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, on February 25 I asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Perrault) whether he would be prepared to make public the allocation of funds under the Local Initiatives Program for each province, and whether he would also be prepared to make available at the earliest possible date information on the amount of money spent in each province and the total number of applications received from each province under this program. On a number of occasions I consented to postpone taking up this matter in the adjournment debate. The most recent occasion was last Thursday night when the parliamentary secretary asked if I would postpone raising the matter that night. I can understand why he did so: it was because the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Mackasey) had another announcement to make the next day about the extension of the program.

• (2200)

I have taken note of some of the information that has been made available since that time both by way of news releases and answers to questions posed in the House by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) and myself. It has been revealed that \$152 million will be spent under the Local Initiatives Program, on the basis of present information and before the extended time and amounts are taken into account.

I think it is worth while to take note of some of the distribution of these expenditures across Canada. In analysing some of this material we find that a high percentage of these expenditures was made in the Atlantic provinces and in the province of Quebec. Some 42 per cent of the total amount available under LIP was spent in the province of Quebec and 21 per cent in the four Atlantic provinces. In both cases these figures were considerably higher than the proportion of unemployment in those provinces in relation to total unemployment in Canada. There was one answer given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North that I found rather disturbing. That was the answer to the question:

What criteria were used in the provincial allocations for both municipalities and local groups?

The answer was:

The allocation was made proportionate to unemployment in the provinces to the base rate of 4.5 per cent unemployment and adjusted for out migration and native population that would not otherwise be reflected in unemployment figures.

In addition to the use of the unemployment figure itself, this of course is quite valid and in line with what some of us have advanced for some time, that account be taken of the out migration factor and of native population because they are not included in the normal labour force figures. However, I submit that these criteria do not take account of other factors in the economy, particularly of the underemployment that we have in some regions of the country.

The fact is that income levels are lower in some parts of the country than in others—in the prairie provinces, to give one example—and these lower income levels are a