

*Social and Economic Security*

called upon, under the narrow definition in the regulations. But if he has been on welfare and has not worked for five years, he can qualify for as much as \$100 a week if he goes to an upgrading school. A young fellow called on me at my office today, a strapping Canadian willing to do a day's work. We went to Carleton University to improve his qualifications after drawing unemployment insurance benefits for a couple of weeks. While he was there he got a bill demanding a refund of what he had drawn. If I were that young Canadian I doubt whether my reaction would be as mild as his was.

There has to be a better system of ascertaining real labour needs in Canada. Is it necessary to turn people out in scores as electricians or plumbers to find that the labour market is already glutted with that type of person? I believe the three-year labour requirement should be revised. At present, before a person can enter an upgrading school he must show that he has been on the labour market for three years. That requirement should be eliminated. A move was made in this direction by the Minister of Manpower when he announced a \$15 million on the job program. He said, with respect to training of this type, there was no need for the requirement that the trainee should have spent three years in the labour force. The present provision discriminates against a young person who is willing to enter an upgrading school. Then there is the requirement that anyone taking part in this type of training cannot continue for longer than 52 weeks. How absurd that is, when one considers that there are probably thousands of disadvantaged Canadians who might well be required to attend for two years before being able to moving into a technical training institution to better themselves. They probably include many who have 30 or 40 years of productive activity before them. This requirement should be eliminated.

I believe there should be some mechanism by which new apprentices can more easily find their way into industry. How often have hon. members received letters from young people saying they have just finished their trade training, with an "A" certificate in mechanics, boiler maintenance or some other craft, only to be told at the Manpower office that they must have experience?

• (9:50 p.m.)

In most European countries there are schemes whereby governments encourage industry, through the use of incentives of various kinds, to subsidize initial employment opportunities for young apprentices for a year or so. This is something the Canadian government should consider. It is absolutely frustrating for our young people to walk out of training institutions at the age of 18 up to 25, full of vim and vigour, having listened to their teachers from kindergarden talking of the virtues of education, only to find that after all their formal education they cannot find their way into the labour force of Canada.

I am sure you are eager, Mr. Speaker, to announce that my time is up, so I shall end on the point made by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) who had something to say about owning property. There is one fundamental aspect in this regard of which the government seems to be unaware. The best way to assist the people of Canada today who are poverty-stricken—I am not talking about the lame, the incapacitated, the blind or

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

the elderly who need a better social system, but about able-bodied Canadians, 447,000 of whom are out of work—is to get the economy rolling again.

This government has been in power for 3½ years and has been espousing a just society and the elimination of regional disparity. There must be some way to get the unemployed back to work. There is no substitute for the way of life in which a man gets up in the morning, climbs into his vehicle, whether it be a dump truck, a half-ton pick-up or a 1947 model, who has a little home and back yard, who does a full day's work, and at the end of the week brings home his pay cheque. That is the essence of living.

It is not good for Canada, or for any other country for that matter, to have to pay its people with a government pay cheque. The essence of living is for the government to provide opportunities for people to work and to make some contribution to their family, to the community, to the country, to mankind and society. This is what my hon. friends to my left do not understand. One hon. member to my left, who is a big spender, qualified two years ago for the old age pension, yet I have never heard him or any of his colleagues talk about how to get the economy rolling in order that our people can obtain a better living.

This is why I become excited about the half million Canadians who are unemployed. They should be taking part day after day in some constructive employment activity so that they can go home in the evening feeling proud of themselves. I hear nothing from the government about this. They seem unaware that Canadians across this country, from little old Newfoundland to west of Vancouver, need jobs. This half million is crying out for jobs. They are not interested in somebody giving them \$5 extra during the winter months for welfare or to buy some extra oil. They are interested in their homes, their jobs. The opportunity to work is the right of all Canadians across the whole dominion.

The sooner we elect people to positions of political authority who are willing to work toward such a goal, the sooner the Canadian people will put aside their frustrations, anxieties and fears and play their rightful part in an active economy. This is the attitude that members on this side of the House display and the kind of policy that we promote. I am confident that the Canadian people will buy this policy in the not too distant future.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Brome-Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) gives us today an opportunity to discuss a major problem in any society, namely the best way to fight the poverty which unfortunately is the lot of too many people, in an era when technological advances have led to the solution of so many problems and facilitated the progress of humanity in so many ways.

I regret that the few remaining minutes will not allow me to complete my remarks in this respect and I hope to have another opportunity to express my views on this important problem of poverty in Canada.

Of course, it is not easy to determine a poverty line. Poverty has been described as lack of money, which is a relative definition, as inadequate access to some of the goods, services and living conditions to which others have