

Employment of Graduate Students

the hon. member for Vegreville. I was trying to demonstrate the need for an immediate debate on this urgent problem. After the House rose, I was interviewed by a newsmen and asked what could be done about the problem. I replied that very little could be done in the immediate future to solve the situation, but I did make one suggestion, and that was concerning manpower policies.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration left the House, went before a microphone and deliberately and calculatedly misrepresented every single word I said. He picked phrases out of the air, twisted words, added on "isms", modified all kinds of adjectives and sent out across the nation a terrible response to what was a fairly responsible statement. He has done the same thing today, and I am very disappointed in his attitude.

Many suggestions have been made with regard to measures that might be taken to help remedy the situation. We hoped that the minister would be in the House to act as a catcher to field these suggestions. I should like to place them on record in the vain hope that one of these days one of the members below the ministerial level will pick them up and react accordingly.

For example, as the Leader of the Opposition said, no solution would be as beneficial as a total revamping of our economic policies in order to buoy up the economy and have appreciable effect on the unemployment situation. This, of course, is a long-term proposition. One member in the House mentioned a few days ago relaxing government requirements regarding student loans that are outstanding and which are being assumed by a lot of our young people.

Another suggestion was made with regard to extending our manpower programs. Many young people are involved in manpower programs. As everybody knows, there is only a 52-week upgrading program. This means that after that period these people are forced out on the street. This situation adds to the 43 per cent increase which was referred to. Another suggestion was that we should relax the regulations in respect of manpower training which require that a person must have been in the labour force for one year. I believe there is a clearcut case here for relaxing the regulations. I do not know whether the suggestion made is a good one, but it seems plausible to me and I should like a responsible minister to explore it.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Another suggestion was made by my colleague the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) concerning militia training. What a time in Canadian history this would be to have many of our young people brought into a militia training program to bolster their moral fibre! I do not advocate military conscription but, rather, a militia training program which would help strengthen the disciplinary fibre of the young people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): If the hon. member seeks unanimous consent of the House to complete his remarks, I would ask whether hon. members agree to allow the hon. member to complete his point.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lundrigan: I appreciate the courtesy, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that this is a prime time for us to investigate the possibility of mobilizing our teaching professionals in the Canadian nation. We should have a program in which total use is made of our educational facilities, not only manpower facilities, in an effort to work sensibly toward the upgrading of young Canadians, perhaps just academically. The alternative is welfare, total unemployment and deprivation. Neither alternative is a good one, welfare and deprivation on the one hand or just a crash program in manpower upgrading on the other. Although neither is a good alternative, I think the latter is preferable.

I think there is a good opportunity to bring many young people into upgrading programs. There is not much advantage in having young Canadians in educational programs if they have nothing to do afterward, but I do not think we should give up in this respect. I believe that in the long run we will reap great benefits. There is not an economist in North America who would deny that we would reap great benefits from having manpower programs for young people even if today the graduates become disillusioned because of the difficulty in obtaining employment.

The other day the minister indicated that our manpower institutions are already overcrowded. He asked what we would have him do. He asked whether we wished him to turn out all those people over age 25 and bring in people under 25. That is ridiculous: no one ever suggested that. The suggestion was based on the fact that the minister had average intelligence and could see the possibility of utilizing other facilities such as churches, auditoriums and classrooms in day schools so that these people could be provided with a shot in the arm in this respect. Perhaps the minister would like to see these people on the dole for the winter. I am sorry he is not here because I wanted to make some personal observations. The minister might think he is the greatest fellow ever, but many Canadians do not think so.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I too am disappointed that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) is not here. However, I am not too disappointed because the great eminence of the Liberal government is sitting right behind the curtain and I hope that somehow my ideas will filter over to him.

The motion states that the government has inspired false hopes among young people between the ages of 16 and 24 by assuring them that education pays. Of course education pays. If one had listened to the young people three or four years ago one would realize that the last