

*The Economy*

190,000 jobs for students and young people. In actual fact 65,718 of those jobs were casual placements. That means a job for the duration of one week or less, but the minister does not say that. He talks about placements, not about full-time jobs. When you are dealing with placements, a person could have a job in one place for two or three days, then in another place for three or four days, and in still another place for a few days—the same person would be placed six or seven times during the summer. The department counts that as six or seven jobs, and so the figures are deceiving. That is why I asked the minister last week if they would consider dealing in man-days or man-weeks of work, rather than placements.

Members will have noticed press reports on this subject in the past. A headline in the Toronto *Star* just a year ago in May, 1977, read "Grads Job Outlook Grim". A headline in the Ottawa *Citizen* about the same time read "Job Garden not Rosy for University Graduates". In the Montreal *Gazette* of Thursday, May 18, under the heading "Students' Summer Jobs Outlook Bleak" there appears this statement:

But government statistics indicate that no more than 75,000 or about 20 per cent will find jobs through federal and provincial government employment agencies.

Last summer 53,000 students found work through Canada Manpower Centres, and Manpower counsellors predict that this summer they will place no more and perhaps less, than last year.

This prediction by Manpower counsellors in Montreal indicates they are expecting less this year than last year.

Perhaps I can close by reciting a poem by Kipling. The blame for the very gloomy prospects for young people at the present time lies with the government which has been in office for the last 15 years. It has known about these statistics for that length of time. Why did it allow this to happen? Why will our grandchildren say? They will probably curse the current group of politicians. Perhaps they will have some right to curse them and feel cynical.

I think that a suitable epitaph for the graves of some of the people in cabinet who have known of the problems but have not come up with a solution could read as follows:

I could not dig; I dared not rob;  
Therefore I lied to please the mob.  
Now all my lies are proved untrue  
I could not face the land I slew.  
What tale shall serve me here among  
Mine angry and defrauded young?

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat concentrated his remarks on one of the several paragraphs of the motion before us today. It will come as no surprise to my colleagues if I state that it is my intention to concentrate my remarks on another of the many sections of this motion.

I congratulate the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) and his friends in the Social Credit party for including in today's motion the important issue of making pensions available on a voluntary basis at age 60. Perhaps I might be permitted to read the preamble of the motion, together with paragraph (2):

[Mr. Dick.]

That this House strongly condemns the government:

(2) for failing to present to parliament new and effective measures such as granting at age 60 the right to the voluntary benefits of the old age security pension;

I want to assert once again that this issue of lowering the pensionable age will not go away. I know that the government strives to blur the issue by telling us that we are in a time of restraint. I heard that message when I first came to parliament a long time ago. I know, too, that the government likes to talk about the desire of many people now to work beyond age 65 or 70. I join in that sentiment, I may say. I know also that the government emphasizes its concern to do something not only for those between ages 60 and 65, but for those who are having a tough time between ages 50 and 60 or, indeed, at any age. Those points are all valid, but they do not wipe out the urgent need in our society for giving more consideration to people between the ages of 60 and 65.

When I think of this issue I think of two main groups. If I indicate that one of them consists mainly of men and the other consists mainly of women, I shall probably be told there are no others, but in any case I have two main groups in mind.

My constituency of Winnipeg North Centre is one in which very large numbers of workers are employed in heavy industry. They work day by day, month by month, year by year in the railway shops, the steel mills, the rolling mills, the packing plants, the clothing establishments, and so on, where the work is heavy and sometimes not the most interesting. These workers find that when they reach age 55 or 58 the rat race gets pretty hard for them. If there is one request that is made to me by my constituents, particularly when I meet them at their places of work, it is to get that pension age down to 60.

I plead that it is just as urgent an issue in this day and age as it was a number of years ago to get the pension age down from 70 to 65. As I say, I join in the various views that have been expressed about doing something for other groups as well. I just say that instead of talking about any of these issues, something should be done. This issue is one that sooner or later this parliament must grapple with and, in my book, it should be done sooner rather than later.

In urging that there be pension available at age 60, I want to make it clear, as I have done so often, that I am not advocating that there be a universal pension at age 60 as there is at age 65, but rather—in line with the words of the motion—that it be available on a voluntary basis. My suggestion is that the rule that should be applied is simply the rule of whether one is in or out of the work force. My contention is that if a person is out of the labour market, whether by withdrawing from it or never having been in it, that at age 60 that person should be entitled to the full amount of the pension under the Old Age Security Act, and also that that person, if he has been a contributor thereto, should be entitled to the full amount that he has earned under the Canada Pension Plan.

● (1432)

I like the fact that the suggestion about reducing the pension age to age 60 in this motion is placed in the context of our economic problems, including the problem of unemployment,