

This government places the responsibility on the local municipality. This is not good enough.

We cannot keep on shrugging off these problems in the hope that they will disappear because they will not. I suggest we should have an immediate crash program in an effort to retrain these young people now so that they will not be roaming around unemployed. This would not only help the individuals concerned but would help our economy in general. Economists have said that we lose billions of dollars each and every year because people in Canada are unemployed. Why do we not put some of the unemployed university students to work teaching other unemployed young people skills so that they can make a contribution to Canada, to themselves and to their families.

In conclusion, I suggest that the government begin a new program to create jobs in Canada. This should include a program to regain control of the Canadian economy. In addition, the manpower regulations should be amended so that people with less than three years on the labour market could qualify for retraining and assistance. Finally, I suggest the government should begin immediately to institute policies that would make university education and other post-secondary education more universally accessible to all, regardless of one's financial background. If we do these things we are on the road to some progress in this country. If we do not, let us ask why our young people in Canada rebel and challenge the system. They challenge the system because your system has failed. They know you have failed them.

● (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before the Chair puts the subamendment before the House, may I ask whether any hon. members have representations which they may wish to make to the Chair with respect to the procedural correctness of the subamendment?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to do so. If I may speak simply on the procedural correctness of the subamendment, I certainly have no particular objection to any number of amendments of a different form and kind coming before the House in a debate such as this, but it does seem to me that it is worth pointing out that the thrust of the most recent amendment is, in part at least, directly inconsistent with the thrust of the original motion. As I read it, the original motion indicates the feeling of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) that we have too much education, that it is a bad thing that we have so much education, and the amendment would suggest in effect that there should be facilities for providing more of it to a wider group of people. That inconsistency should be pointed out to Your Honour.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) was once a law professor. I hope he taught his students a little more logically than he is trying to teach the members of this House. The original motion by the hon. member for

Employment of Graduate Students

Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) does not state that there is too much education. It suggests that those who are getting education are being misled by hopes for full employment so that their services could be used. He does not say that there should not be any more education or that there is too much.

Second, the subamendment moved by my friend, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), does not deal with education. It deals with training under the minister. He does not refer to university education but rather to training and allowances under the minister's department. The minister may want to run away from his responsibility to deal with the question posed by the subamendment, but he cannot suggest that the subamendment is out of order. It clearly follows the amendment before the House, and I agree with what it says, that the government has not adopted fiscal and economic policies to stimulate the economy. The subamendment goes on to say in particular that the government does not follow policies of full employment and has not amended the regulations under the minister's jurisdiction. I cannot for the life of me see what basis the minister has for his objection to the procedural propriety of the subamendment.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one short comment. I think the minister is merely nit-picking. I believe that the amendment points out that there is a lack of co-ordination between the educational process and the ability to receive jobs, and the subamendment suggests that measures should be instituted to prepare people for useful occupation. After all, that is the content and purport of the motion.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The contention of the minister that the original motion advances the theory there is too much education certainly does not indicate that the minister has read the motion.

An hon. Member: No, but he listened to the speech.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The motion indicates that young people coming out of schools and universities find no outlets for their energies and no means of placing the knowledge they have acquired at the service of the people. It then goes on to advance the particular monetary theories which the Ralliement Creditiste hold. The criticism in the motion is that young people coming out of educational institutions are unable to find employment. The latter part of the motion indicates why they are unable to find employment. If the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is out of order, then so is the amendment which indicates that the reason these young people are unable to find jobs is that the government has not adopted such fiscal and economic policies as would stimulate the economy and allow young people to better contribute to national growth. I agree with that amendment.