

projects were approved which engendered 27,525 jobs with a total commitment of \$26,335,000. (7:31) A two-tier formula for distribution of funds regionally to the 33 management areas was evolved, based on the geographic distribution of the 15 to 25 year age group according to the 1971 census, and the known number of private sector jobs normally available for students. An advisory group was attached to each management area made up of nominees suggested by members of Parliament and appointed by the Minister annually. Those appointed were required to be representative of community interests. At least one member of the advisory group had to be under 25 years of age. The Committee was assured that the bulk of applications recommended by the advisory groups were officially authorized to receive grants. (7:14)

The objective of the program was to provide short-term employment for students. In 1974 grants were about equally divided among secondary school students, and post-secondary school students from community colleges/CEGEP and universities. (7:33) Preference was given to projects that attempted to find new solutions or created new approaches to community services without duplicating existing programs. Projects developed from apparent community needs. They involved students in various types of work—social service, information, recreation, culture, environmental studies, research or business. (7:32) The balance between male and female participants was almost equal and the ratio of rural to urban projects was also about one to one. In recognition of the fact that those participants who were post-secondary school students needed more financial assistance to facilitate the continuation of their education, the wage rate per week was deliberately established at a higher rate for them than for secondary school students. Experience in the administration of this program led to the alteration of specific regulations each year. The Division obviously felt that in 1974, and in their plans for 1975, a much better defined and regulated program had been put in place.

Projects approved under this program were increasingly tightly monitored by field officers appointed by the Division. Each such officer was assigned a caseload of OFY projects and kept in constant touch with the progress of the project throughout the authorized period. Officials of the Audit Services Bureau of the Department of Supply and Services also carried out audits of OFY projects.

The criticism most often made of the Opportunities for Youth Program was that it provided employment chiefly for students with adequate family support behind them. The Division attempted to answer this criticism statistically by indicating that on the basis of the 1972 program, 51 per cent of the student participants came from families whose income was in the \$5,000 to \$15,000 range and 18.5 per cent came from families earning less than \$5,000 per annum. (7:38) But this means that just over 30 per cent of the grants still went to students from families with earnings over \$15,000 per year.

The Committee was satisfied that the OFY program was adequately monitored. Obviously only short-term objectives could be attempted by projects which were to last but ten weeks. The concept of giving responsibility for the