

young people are challenging the values of the society which provided them with these benefits. I am not suggesting they are unjust or ungrateful, rather, I submit that is an entirely logical result. Because these young people are secure and have not known want, they are sufficiently without fear to be able to devote their energy to a critique of society's values, and when they find them wanting, to undertake many forms of rebellion against these values. They are free, as no previous generation has been, to say they just do not want to work, or the work must be worth while both in terms of its contribution to society and in terms of its contribution to the development of their potential as individuals before they will accept it.

What many of the young people are really engaged in is a redefinition of what constitutes a worth-while lifestyle and what constitutes a worth-while contribution to society; in fact, it is a redefinition of the meaning of work itself. It is becoming increasingly clear that to growing numbers of young people work is not to be the principal and dominant factor in their lives, as it is with most of the working population today. Increasingly, work is seen as providing them not with their principal role but with an avenue to a better life and the wherewithal to exploit what has heretofore been called leisure time.

Perhaps I could give an example of the sort of thing which indicates to me that this is the kind of thinking among the young people of this country. May I suggest to hon. members that they look at the decrease in the rate of anticipated enrolment in universities as compared to the completely unexpected rise in enrolment in junior colleges. This suggests that the young people are not going to be deliberately seeking to entrench themselves in occupations which must dominate, by definition, their entire lives but, rather, they are trying to seek meaningful employment which will give them enough free time to engage in other occupations and avenues of interest.

Growing numbers of young people tend to define quality of life not in economic terms or in terms of numbers of material possessions, as we have been accustomed to do, but rather in terms of humanity, in the liberation of the human spirit and in man's relation with nature. Quality of life thus becomes a sort of social ecology. Therefore, among many young people there is concern for our environment and that is why in any environmental group by far the majority will be persons under 30.

A lot of what I have just said may appear to be lacking in substance, vague, woolly and avoiding reality. Each of these charges might have some validity. But I submit that the very nature of the phenomena with which we are dealing, a social revolution, a destruction of old ways and thinking and a replacement of them by new ways, a change in society's system of values, simply does not permit one to speak with any great precision. As an aside, I might suggest that it is this very fact which helps to account for what is often perceived to be an exasperating inarticulateness on the part of young people attempting to explain their thinking, because for the most part the young are in the forefront of the social revolution we are experiencing.

What is becoming increasingly apparent to me is that the changes taking place in our value system, especially the abandonment of the protestant work ethic, will find

### *Unemployment among Youth*

their first concrete manifestations in changed attitudes toward employment and corresponding changes in our institutions of commerce, industry and government. There will be increasing pressure for shorter working days, combined with a shorter work week. Both have already been achieved by limited numbers of workers, especially in the craft unions. Experiments are being carried on in a number of industries, a good example of which is currently under way in the Imperial Oil refinery in my constituency where shift workers in the processing unit are working 12-hour shifts three or four days a week instead of an eight-hour shift five days a week, so as to give them larger blocks of time to devote to their families, hobbies and avocations as opposed to their work. It appears they are successful at the moment.

Such demands are being made and such experiments are being conducted not because people want to get away with doing less, but because they want to live more. A life arranged around the demands of the factory is no longer, if it ever was, considered to be very attractive. Public policy can either encourage or discourage this trend, or it can remain indifferent to it. I think it is this government's attitude to ignore the trend if, indeed, it is aware such a trend exists. My feeling is that the trend should be actively encouraged.

I would remind hon. members that federally and provincially there are laws on the statute books governing hours of work, conditions of employment and vacations. They are there because legislators eventually, after much effort was expended by trade unions and other organizations to convince them of the fact, became persuaded that such laws were necessary to the health of the working population. Surely it is as much our concern to ensure that the working population has the time available to it to live a meaningful life as it is our concern to legislate for the health of that same working population.

I see a need for revision of legislation governing hours of work and I suggest that the government, if it were doing its job, would be actively concerning itself with such considerations at this moment. In any event, it will soon be forced to do so because the young people now entering the labour force in such great numbers will demand that it do so, and that demand will be strong enough to necessitate a response.

I see as a second major trend in new employment patterns arising out of the changing value system, increasing demands on the part of the organized labour force for participation by the worker in the making of decisions, long thought to be the prerogative of management, about such things as the introduction of new technology, about production, about the allocation of capital, about the nature and price of products and about the distribution of profits.

Once again there are immense implications for public policy involved, and once again the government should be actively preparing itself to meet these demands as they arise, as they surely will, if social and economic chaos is to be avoided. The degree of education, both formal and informal, which our young people have simply will not permit industry and commerce to continue to operate, if I can exaggerate slightly, on the basis of the master and slaves principle. The labour force will not permit that, and