

priorities for the future. One is led to question whether the government has any long-term strategy for the economic and social development of Canada. Where is the government leading us? Does it know? I doubt it.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) himself admitted in committee on May 15 this year that, "I would argue that we have made ad hoc decisions with regard to the direct employment programs from time to time, and it may be necessary in the future to continue to do that depending on the fluctuation of employment and unemployment." What will be the government's reaction if unemployment is significantly reduced? Will it cancel a program which may have proved worthwhile in some aspects?

There is little question in any of our minds that these programs were produced chiefly from the pressure of economic circumstances and were offered as a substitute for unemployment, as a means of reducing unemployment. We would never argue that unemployment insurance or welfare are superior alternatives to work opportunity programs. But one of the most serious shortcomings of such programs is the frustration caused by the cessation of projects that have become an integral and meaningful experience for both project workers and those receiving the projects' aid. This is one of my reasons for asking for legislation.

As it stands now, OFY, New Horizons and LIP type programs are scattered over many departments. They affect the priorities and planning in many departments such as Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Agriculture, Indian and Northern Affairs, Health and Welfare, just to name a few. And I was told this morning that this debate is to be fielded on the government side by the spokesman of another department speaking on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury).

Some of these programs are difficult to find in their budgetary manifestation, OFY, for example, is administered by the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner), and yet it is impossible to find in the budgetary provisions of the Secretary of State any mention of OFY. I leaf through the estimates to no purpose. Why is that? Where is it? I eventually found it in the budgetary provisions of the President of the Treasury Board, and only part of the item, part of Vote No. 10, is for OFY.

Vote 10 provides \$54½ million for student summer employment and, I note, "including an Opportunity for Youth Program." But how much of the \$54½ million is for an Opportunity for Youth Program? Why are things not clearer in the budget? Is it intended to dazzle, bewilder, or just to confuse? Why all this obfuscation? Here surely is divide and misrule, if ever I saw it.

The government must be consistent in its goals. It must provide some security through legislation. If the government were truly interested in individual fulfilment it would provide Canada with the atmosphere in which long-term job opportunities would be created, or at least reasonably long-term job opportunities that allow for the development of skills. Yet the government has put little real effort into creating long-term job opportunities.

LIP type projects do little to provide any continuing benefit, such as the acquisition of skills or, most impor-

### *Appropriation Act*

tant, future job security. They do not provide, and this is most important, circumstances by which a man can pursue a career pattern and fulfill his economic needs. This is certainly one of the most damning criticisms to be levelled at these programs.

In the 1971-72 LIP program, extensions of the program from May 31 to June 16, to September 30 and then to November 30, 1972 substantially altered it from a winter job creating program to one of continuing employment aid.

The announcement that the program will be extended this year until June 30 for all projects of an educational nature, and until November 30 for all projects involving native people, projects with the potential of becoming self-sustaining businesses, and projects in any area in which the March unadjusted unemployment rate was higher than 6.8 per cent, is a sure indication that again the program is one of continuing employment aid. If this is the purpose then why have the government not introduced legislation? What kind of scrutiny is being carried out by the Treasury Board before the estimates are presented in committee when it is obvious from past experience that the programs cost much in excess of the sums mentioned? The entry in the 1972-73 budget, for example, against this item is \$25 million with a forecast based on the previous year that it was going to cost \$125 million—\$100 million more. In the 1973-74 budget, although only \$10 million is requested the forecast for 1972-73 is \$254 million. Here is real confusion, and confusion compounded, because only part of this sum is allocated for the LIP programs.

• (1710)

As early as January of this year, in his contribution to the Throne Speech debate, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) admitted, as reported at page 105 of *Hansard*, that there had been another \$125 million obtained in October, presumably through warrants. This gives us a measure of the deception perpetrated on this House, the government submitting a request for \$10 million this year for a LIP program which is obviously going to cost a great deal more. Recognizing that only \$10 million was sought this year, how much will Parliament be asked to find in the 1973-74 supplementaries to complete these programs? This, Mr. Speaker, is not proper government; this is misleading ad hocery at its worst, and it is thoroughly confusing to boot to me and to all other members.

Do the Department of Manpower and Immigration and Treasury Board intend to initiate another winter works program to combat the seasonal rise in unemployment? If so, why has this intention not been shown to us and to the people in the estimates on indirect legislation? Can this be taken as a demonstration that the 1972-73 program was a failure?

I also have a number of questions with regard to auditing. A reliable source has stated that an internal directive issued stated that no projects under \$15,000 were to be audited unless there was a signed statement that the project would require special consideration—if it had received a bad press, for example, or there was suspicion of fraud, or when irregular business practices had occurred. Legislation incorporating the criteria for a proper audit procedure would assure the people that a