

that it is responsible for the creation of a better social climate for all Canadians.

Owing to the great number of unemployed in Canada, several ministers have certainly tried to develop industry by means of various grants. They have succeeded in creating new industries, but it has been very difficult to prevent the phasing out of existing ones.

I would like to reiterate the proposal which I made a year and a half ago about the old age security pension at 60. I know that there are between 350,000 and 400,000 workers between 60 and 65 years of age. As there are between 700,000 and 800,000 unemployed, paying the old age pension at 60 years of age could improve the unemployment situation by 50 per cent. Legislation to this effect would have several consequences at the social level. I believe it is normal to consider granting holidays to deserving people, to people of 60 who are now working in industries and have lost part of their strength. It would be perfectly normal, logical and humane to seriously consider allowing people of 60 years of age and over to take a vacation. Taking into account the benefits they receive at the present time, it is very embarrassing for these people to think of retiring at 60.

Could we consider doubling these old age pensions? No doubt someone will answer me that money is at stake, but we should perhaps assess the present cost of welfare and unemployment. If we count what is being spent for the 700,000 or 800,000 unemployed, it would be easy for us to make a transfer of funds which would enable persons aged 60 or more to take holidays, as I was saying a short while ago, and to increase appreciably their pension, which would enable them to retire and, by the same token, from 350,000 to 400,000 jobs would be created.

In my opinion, this measure should be seriously considered by the government. This is not the first time that I have had the opportunity to mention this. It would be of such a nature as to considerably improve the situation. I think that this is a positive and constructive suggestion.

Taking into account the budget we will have shortly, I wish to urge the government to abolish the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials, and I hope that some mention of this will be made in the budget to be brought down Friday.

I hope that the necessary supplies will be voted, that the necessary changes will be made, so that persons aged 60 may take a well-earned retirement and thus make room for those between 20 and 30 who are waiting for a chance to earn their living decently.

I also ask the government to give careful consideration to the question of jobs for students. I know that it has introduced the Opportunities for Youth Program. The method used for its application is questionable. The government is to be commended for wanting to find as many jobs as possible, but we know that not all projects submitted were accepted. We are quite aware that most of these projects were rejected, and I wonder to what extent we disappointed some of our young people. I would have

Alleged Non-Institution of Just Society

liked the government to draw up a series of projects, to urge the young people to carry out some projects prepared under the supervision of experts. This would have greatly helped the entire Canadian community.

I therefore hope that next year, the government will draw up worthwhile projects for the community. Youth should be asked to join in and be offered every possible employment. It is up to the government to create employment for students, but still, we should stop wondering if enough funds will be available. We should see to it that they are, so that young people will find summer jobs.

I would also have hoped that the wish expressed last year during the Liberal convention by the young Liberals who requested a civil service designed to create jobs for a great many students. Since it was a wish expressed by the young people of Canada, the government may have made a mistake by not carrying out the resolution passed during that convention.

Mr. Speaker, I should not like to confine myself primarily to criticisms of the government. It seems more meaningful to me to bring forward suggestions and I dare hope the government is paying serious attention to our representations.

Opposition members, at one point, criticized the Prime Minister and his travels, and I disagree with them. There was some demagoguery involved there. Unfortunately there is always too much of that. In order to achieve the just society we must, as opposition members, acquire the habit of supporting good legislation and condemning bad legislation.

Of course all legislation brought forward by the government is not necessarily bad. Certainly some is desirable and advisable. But, unfortunately, I must admit—and it is for that reason I am sitting in the House as an independent—that opposition parties too often tends to use filibustering tactics, and, after a certain amount of time has been wasted in the House, they accuse the government of not launching some program.

This kind of things explains why people have lost confidence in the members of the opposition and the government and we are responsible for that situation.

They blame the Prime minister for making trips throughout the world: I, for one, would rather see the Prime minister go to Russia, to the United States or elsewhere in order to sign agreements than some second-rate official.

● (4:50 p.m.)

Those who have blamed the Prime Minister should look at their own party: the leader of their own party also made trips to various countries of the world and in Canada. I believe it to be normal also that the leader should be travelling around and not any individual member. I must also admit objectively that the Prime minister's trips have often lead to some agreements which have proven beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that my time has elapsed. Therefore, I hope the government will lend a welcoming ear to the suggestions I have made and I expect that the