Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) by name. It is wrong for a member to refer to another member by his family name.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may continue, I notice the Secretary of State for External Affairs—

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member, but we have reached the hour of ten o'clock. Before calling it ten o'clock I must inquire of hon. members whether it is the desire of the House that the question be put on the amendment now before the House. My understanding of the order made earlier today is that all motions should be submitted to the House at this time and that the divisions will take place tomorrow at the time of calling government business, except, of course, on the main motion. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the amendment. Moved by Mr. Atkey, seconded by Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):

That the motion be amended by inserting in the first paragraph thereof, next after the word "Canada", the words "since 1967".

All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed to the amendment will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: The recorded division will be deferred until tomorrow after the other amendments and subamendments have been dealt with, pursuant to order of the House agreed to earlier today.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

MANPOWER—LOCAL INITIATIVE PROGRAMS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROGRESS IN APPROVING PROJECTS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, on January 8 I asked the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) for some explanation of the situation with regard to the concern of organizations and communities, particularly in high unemployment areas, over delays in having their projects approved. I also requested the minister to make a statement on motions outlining the reasons for the difficulties, the state of progress to this date, and the expected date of final approval.

• (2200)

I realize that many questions of a similar nature have been asked since and also that the minister has answered many of them piecemeal. However, I feel that if he would make a statement on motions as requested it would help clear up a number of ambiguities which exist. I am besieged daily with phone calls from organizations in my district seeking answers to these questions which could easily be cleared up by a statement giving all the details. Members could then help their constituents who are becoming more and more frustrated each day by the lack of answers.

The special co-ordinating group which will be delegated by the minister to look after these applications is just as frustrated because of its difficulty in coping with the situation. I might say, in reply to a suggestion made by the minister last week in the House to the effect that not enough use is being made of the on-the-job training program, that he might apply to his own department for such a program so that he can provide additional staff which would then be available to process applications, especially those over $75,000 which require much more detailed information. Many organizations and communities are unable to cope with the provision of this detailed information and are frustrated in their attempts to get their applications approved.

The other problem that exists is the disappointment being experienced by organizations that have already been notified that their projects have been turned down. This is destroying the initiative of citizens who are trying to carry out and achieve the objects of the program. Particularly disappointing is the fact that many projects approved last year could not be completed for lack of sufficient funds, and if they are not approved this year many will be left half done and will result in the waste of many dollars.

The common sense solution to the whole problem of "not enough money chasing too many projects" would be to make the program an on-going one, or at least a five-year program, so that communities can plan to provide the public services required to make them more self-sufficient, at the same time creating continuing employment over a longer period. Under a five-year program communities could plan their needs, such as water and sewage systems which are basic to every community in Canada, recreational facilities, roads to resources, farming and fishing facilities and other public service needs for which municipalities are not able to get money from the provinces or the federal government without much difficulty. I brought this idea to the attention of the former minister of manpower, who agreed with it and has since mentioned that the LIP program should be an on-going one. I hope the present minister will consider this idea carefully.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in many government departments funds are allocated to provinces to fulfil the needs of many of the projects that are being turned down for lack of funds. I think it is time that consideration was given by each department to the allocation of funds for projects under LIP, thus making the Local Initiatives Program meangingful.

The minister also confirmed the fact in the House last week that a new supplemental program called LEAP—