

12.2 per cent, representing approximately 398,000 unemployed youth. At that time unemployment in the United States for youth was about the same as what it is now. We have surpassed that.

These costly, non-productive programs have jeopardized our economy and placed unreal pressure on small business, the real engine of growth and the only solution to job creation. These programs have led to high taxation. They have bled the country and business by not allowing for hiring and the expansion of youth training and actual youth employment. Excessive taxation, a lack of incentive for investment and no reward for risk by the Government has led to the horror story we see today.

There are solutions. The first one I would like to talk about is co-op education. I have visited Douglas College in my riding and Douglas College in the riding of New Westminster-Coquitlam. What is continually pointed out is the lack of understanding by the federal Government in dealing with the other two levels, the educators and the province.

The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) demanded an amendment to Bill C-12, urging the federal Government to negotiate with provincial education ministers and provincial educators, as agreed to by the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal). That was raised in the House yesterday. All of this has taken so much time that we are now in the midst of a crisis and the Government is trying to adjust. We have been saying this for the last nine months that I have been here.

The Hon. Member for Eglinton-Lawrence talked about training. You can train everybody in the world to the highest degree, but if they have no job to go to and there is not a sound basis for an economy in which small business can develop, such training is useless.

We have pointed out a solution time after time in this House with regard to youth employment, namely our resources. Youth are adaptable to reforestation employment and physical work. The long-term effects of farming our forests instead of mining them would be beneficial in years to come as well as solving the problem at the present time.

May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but it is now one o'clock. He will be able to continue his remarks this afternoon, when the House resumes the debate.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

S.O. 21

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, while following up on a complaint from a constituent last week, I was reminded of the holes in the Unemployment Insurance Act through which a truck could be driven. It seems that the interpretation and the definition of full-time versus part-time employment differs in the Act depending on where the book is opened.

In the case of my constituent, the UIC had completely cut off his benefits because he had taken a part-time job. Fortunately, the national office of the UIC overruled the regional office in Barrie and gave him back his benefits retroactive to the cut-off date.

I feel that there are many people being victimized by the system in this way, most of whom would not think to contact their Member of Parliament to work on their behalf. I maintain that when a UIC recipient suspects that the system is not serving his or her best interests, that person should exercise his or her rights by contacting Ottawa. Meanwhile, it is the duty of the House to realign the Unemployment Insurance Act before the rights of others are completely undermined.

My constituent is happy with the action which has now been taken. What can we do about the thousands of people who are not happy?

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

PLIGHT OF ANDREI SAKHAROV AND SPOUSE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, the civilized world is aghast at the pitiless persecution of both Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Yelena Bonner. The treatment of the Sakharovs is an indication of the Soviet Union's contempt for human rights. Despite signing the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, which specifically confirms the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in the field of human rights, the Soviet Government has once again shown how few rights and how little dignity the individual is allowed against the brutal and overwhelming power of the state.

Sakharov, who in 1975 won the Nobel Peace Prize and was labeled the spokesman for the conscience of mankind, has been on a hunger strike since May 2. His reason for going on a hunger strike is very simple. His wife is badly in need of an operation, and the Soviet authorities will not allow her to leave the Soviet Union. What type of inhumane system would not grant this simple request?

In light of the treatment of the Sakharovs it becomes easier to understand the actions of a Government that could cold-bloodedly bring about the downing of Korean airliner 007,