

However, Sir, for many years we will still be facing the annual problem of high unemployment among youth, especially during the summer months. Canada's young people are clinging desperately to the hope that the federal government will end its ad hoc efforts to find them jobs—too many of them are not meaningful—and will develop a long-term strategy which will allow them to lend their considerable skills to the development of a thriving and better nation.

It is obvious that the programs introduced by the government have not had the desired affect, especially with respect to our young people. As I said at the outset, there are many hundreds of young people in my riding, indeed in my province and all across Canada, who are facing a very serious problem. Many of them depend upon summer employment in order to continue their education. But too many of them will be faced with the stark reality that the government is unable to provide them with jobs and thereby the opportunity to earn a few dollars during the summer so they may return to university.

In my riding and province the situation is even more critical in that we do not have the industrial giants from whom we can get summer employment for our youth. Many of our young people have been encouraged to go to the trade schools, the fisheries college, and to Memorial University to get an education, only to find later that they are unable to get jobs in their own province. If they hope to get a few months' work during the summer, they must travel to other parts of Canada, thereby denying Newfoundland the benefits of the education they have received. It is a very sad story.

The program which the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) tried to defend is responsible for employing less than one-tenth of the young people in our country. In my riding large groups of young people were encouraged to apply for assistance through the Opportunities for Youth program only to be refused without an explanation. Some of their proposed projects were extremely worth while, good for the students who applied and also good for the communities in which they live. In all too many cases the programs that were approved were slipshod and badly thought out. They were approved at the expense of other programs that could have had a worth-while effect on the province and local communities.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that something has to be done. I think that the program to which the hon. member referred a moment ago was conceived in haste and obviously will not have the desired effect for the young people concerned. I think the program was well summed up by a young man who was a project officer for OFY, when he said that Opportunities for Youth is a human lottery and the most politically partisan job program under federal sponsorship.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaking (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 58(11) the proceedings on the motion have expired.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

[English]

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

#### VETERANS AFFAIRS—CONSIDERATION OF INCREASE IN BASIC RATE OF WAR DISABILITY PENSION AND VETERANS ALLOWANCE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question tonight relates to the need for consideration to be given to an increase in the basic rate of the war disability pension and also to an increase in the basic rate of the war veterans allowance. I must say at the outset that in recent weeks we have been getting the right answers to our questions concerning this matter. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Francis) may therefore wonder why I raise the question again if I admit that we have been getting proper answers.

The fact is that even though we have been given assurances, we have to be on guard to make sure that those assurances are not lost in the scramble to get the present session recessed. And I am also going to be bold enough tonight to make a suggestion of the kind that might not receive the applause of every member of the House if this were two o'clock in the afternoon and all the members were here. But at this time of night, when only the hard workers are still present, I am sure my suggestion will be approved unanimously.

Just to recite briefly what has happened, and without covering all the questions and answers, I would point out that on Friday, March 17, 1972, as reported at page 916 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Laing) if consideration was being given to increasing the basic rate of the war disability pension. The minister's answer was an unequivocal yes. I then asked if consideration was being given to increasing the basic rate of war veterans allowance. The minister made an answer which was a little unequivocal but I dare to believe that he meant yes.

• (2200)

On Friday, May 12 of this year, as recorded at page 2233 of *Hansard*, when the minister was speaking to the bill to attach an escalator clause to pensions and allowances that come under the responsibility of the Department of Veterans Affairs he said very clearly, and we appreciated it, that the escalator clause being put on the basic rate of the war disability pension did not mean that the question of the basic rate had been dealt with; indeed, he gave the firm commitment that it would be dealt with at a later time.

Later in the session the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) and the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles)—a Tory with a good name—started asking questions and eventually got from the Minister of Veterans Affairs the assurance that it would meet with his approval if this matter were referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I followed through by asking the chairman of that commit-