

### *Employment of Graduate Students*

are asking us most sincerely today why we do not do something constructive for them and give them the opportunity to work. These young people are not asking for a handout. I have met very few who want to accept welfare or are willing to live in that way. Because of this we are provoking despair and anger among these young people. We are encouraging young people all over our country to rebel. We have led them down the golden path. We have violence among the young people not only in the universities but outside as well.

Many middle-aged and older politicians stand up and denounce these restless students. They ask why these young people are so lazy. They call them bums, smear them with the big red brush and call them revolutionaries. They say they are trying to destroy the country and the society in which we live. It strikes me that they forget to ask some pretty fundamental questions. They never ask why there is so much despair at this time among the young people. They forget to ask what type of a system led to this despair, and motivated these young people to rebel and challenge the system.

As I stand here in this Parliament, I see our parliamentarians going further and further away from the people, becoming less and less relevant to many people in Canada. We stand around here every day and debate many problems that are important. Many politicians often speak in a patronizing way about these poor young people who cannot find work, but all of a sudden we close our books and forget about them. We do not do anything. It is this approach which is making this Parliament a much more irrelevant institution than it should be. At times we are a mere polite debating society in which we pat each other on the back; we are completely isolated from the world. I cannot tolerate that and I do not think the young people of Canada will tolerate it much longer.

In 1968 we had a new Prime Minister who spoke of a new approach to politics. He gave many young people a new grasp on hope. The young people went for him. The young people of Canada were behind this man; they worked for him and elected him Prime Minister. Now, two years later what do they have? They have a 19th century conservative who has only a little of the modern touch when it comes to style and dress. They have a man who has not changed anything that in a fundamental way would help the people of the country. I suggest that this man has broken faith with the tens of thousands of young people who supported him two years ago and who held high hopes for him and his government. Dozens of these people have come to me over the last few months. They ask why he does not help them. They say they thought he would be good and that he would change the system but that he did not do it. They ask why he does not listen to them and they ask why he has changed.

We can change the system, Mr. Speaker, we can make the system one in which people have work regardless of their age, their racial origin or where they live in Canada. I think a debate like this, if the government listens to it, can provide some positive alternatives. At this time I wish to move an amendment to the amend-

[Mr. Nystrom.]

ment that was submitted by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period to a comma and by adding the following words thereto:

"and, in particular, has failed

(1) to pursue policies of full employment, and

(2) to amend the regulations governing manpower training and allowances so as to enable young Canadians leaving school and those who have been on the labour market for less than three years to receive a training allowance and training necessary to fit them for useful occupations.

Mr. Speaker, I have about four or five minutes left in which I should like to outline a few of my reasons for moving this amendment to the amendment moved by the member of the Conservative party. First of all, if we are to solve the problems of unemployment in respect of our young people, we will have to tackle the unemployment problem in general in Canada. Recently, while I was in Europe, many Europeans asked me in complete surprise why we had so many unemployed in Canada. This astounded them. I suggest that it astounds most Canadians that we should have so much unemployment. There is unemployment because the government has created it. I suggest that if we are to reverse this trend we must begin immediately to introduce programs and projects to stimulate our economy and produce work for Canadians.

Second, I suggest that if in the long run we are to solve the problems of unemployment, regional disparity and poverty, we will have to do something about regaining control of the Canadian economy. Once again today during the question period this problem was raised. We have a branch plant economy. We have a country which is basically an exporter of raw materials and an importer of finished goods. Thus, we export our jobs to the United States and to other countries. If we are to tackle problems such as unemployment, we must reverse the trend of continentalism in Canada and initiate a positive type of nationalism in which we can control and direct our own economy. Then, all Canadians will have jobs and will be able to enjoy a decent life like all people in this House today.

The other point I want to make is that the government should seriously consider amending the manpower retraining program because, as it is now, we find that a young person must be out of school for one year and must have been in the work force for one year before he become eligible for retraining. He must have been in the work force for three years if he is to be eligible for a grant. If a young person is unemployed and is eligible because he has been in the work force for one year he probably requires a grant. Many young people who are unemployed do not qualify for retraining. Because they do not qualify for retraining under the Department of Manpower and Immigration, these young people have become the front line troops in the government's war on inflation. They are the shock troops. They suffer the worst effects of the war on inflation. No effort is made by this government to help these people by amending the program so they might receive some assistance. We seem content to sit back and let these people go on welfare.