

own speeches. The Chair tries to be as lenient as possible but that was the second time the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) had raised this point. He made the point the previous time and the Chair did not object then, but the second time the Chair thought this was becoming a matter of debate.

Mr. MacInnis: Further on the point of order—

An hon. Member: There is no point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: Am I to understand from the ruling of the Chair that ministers are now allowed to impute motives, because when he is referring to a number of projects—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member is debating or questioning the decision which the Chair has rendered. The Chair has recognized the hon. minister, who had the floor.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, which I do not think even the Chair could ignore, the minister is reading from a prepared text. It is against the rules to read a speech in this House. Furthermore, I ask again, through the Chair, whether or not the minister is allowed to impute motives?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. On the first point of order, the Chair is of the opinion that it is well taken but the hon. member also knows that the rule is not very easy to apply because hon. members are entitled to refer to notes. It is very difficult for the Chair to judge when an hon. member who is speaking is referring to notes in front of him, although as I said before such points of order benefit hon. members because they more or less remind hon. members of that rule. It also gives every other participant in the debate an opportunity to keep that point in mind.

On the second point of order, the Chair heard the point raised by the hon. member on the question of motives. If the hon. member wishes to specify the motive, the Chair will take it under advisement.

Mr. MacInnis: I shall accept your invitation and specify the motive, Mr. Speaker. Unless the hon. member for Peace River gave a blanket disapproval of all these projects, the minister cannot single out a few and infer that the hon. member for Peace River has singled them out as not being desirable projects. If the minister, in referring to these projects, is trying to imply that the hon. member for Peace River has disapproved of them, then he is imputing motives.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): That may be in the mind of the hon. member, but the Chair still feels that this is a question of debate and will recognize the hon. minister.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, I certainly hasten to accept the assurance of the hon. House Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Baldwin) that he does not denounce the projects of the Opportunities for Youth program in a blanket fashion—

Opportunities for Youth Program

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanbury:—and that he was referring only to one unfounded allegation yesterday.

An hon. Member: Unfounded?

An hon. Member: It was unfounded.

Mr. Stanbury: I welcome this assurance, and I certainly want to apologize to him if I had the mistaken impression that he thought this program was not an imaginative, efficient and very worth-while one.

The government could simply have increased jobs in the public service and the militia and there would have been no Opportunities for Youth program—no errors, no difficulties, no risks and no tremendous exploration of an idea that has not been tried anywhere else in the world. Or we could have given grants to the amount of \$25 million to projects that would have been controlled by existing organizations. Inevitably, some of the students who would have been thus employed would have run afoul of the law over a three-month period, or some would not have done their job satisfactorily and nothing more would have been heard about it.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the government opted to go directly to youth with an imaginative program. This program is a response to the interests and directions of young Canadians as expressed by young Canadians. In a program such as this, some problems are bound to occur. We expect them. It is a new program. With 2,400 projects from coast to coast and more than 31,000 young people employed, we can expect to have differences of opinion about some of the activities supported. However, in order to have as many views as possible on projects, officials of each provincial government, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, were consulted in advance of projects receiving final approval. A verification mechanism which I have described has been established whereby projects will be reviewed in the communities involved.

Certainly, there have been more projects than we have been able to approve. Certainly, many groups are disappointed that they cannot share in this program. Allocations made on a regional and subregional basis do not guarantee that every city and town will receive tangible employment benefits from Opportunities for Youth. And certainly, many of the projects that did not receive approval could have been approved if even more funds were available. I have already emphasized that the summer 1971 program involved a doubling of expenditures over the 1970's summer funding, and members are well aware of the two-thirds augmentation in the Opportunities for Youth budget itself on the urging of the opposition. Certainly, there have been communications difficulties, delays and inconveniences. The Secretary of State admits this.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Does the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) wish to ask a question?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister a question. He suggests that I did not