

Time Allocation

now so that when the recession ends we could get back to building Canada. If we could see that prospect, then the Government would have no trouble; it would not need to move time allocation. We would agree to pass the legislation because the benefits would be both long and short-term. The reason we are so reluctant to hand over the money that the Government is seeking is that it has not provided the justification that we are asking for. We know that its commitment is of little substance. We know that it does not intend to go ahead with projects that will make Canada a better place in the future and make it easier for people to earn a living here.

This not a blind opposition because Hon. Members opposite happen to form the Government and are a bunch of useless Liberals. The Hon. Member for York-Peel's view is so narrow that he cannot see that in any normal business practice, which he constantly refers to, it is quite common to borrow against future needs.

Last night I noticed an announcement that the Steel Company of Canada is issuing new stock options in order to raise working capital, and that other companies are doing likewise.

Mr. Kempling: Because it lost \$97 million.

Mr. Deans: What the Hon. Member for York-Peel is arguing against is normal business practice. What is wrong with what we are being asked to do is that we do not have a clear indication that the money will be used to develop the country and create the infrastructure that is necessary if we are to achieve the greatness that is our destiny.

I suggest to the Government that it should seriously consider a change in attitude toward the House of Commons and the future of the company.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Lapierre (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be taking part in today's debate on the Borrowing Authority Bill and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to address a matter that has my special interest, namely, the situation of young people in Canada. Ever since I became a Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, I have felt that because of my age, I had a duty to tell our elected representatives, to tell all our colleagues in the House what Canada's young people think and what their concerns are, and to try to be a catalyst, as it were, that would have some effect on the decision-making process.

Mr. Speaker, during these few years, I have had an opportunity, within our existing structures, to propose a series of projects that would to some extent meet the needs of Canada's young people, and the first one on my list is of course the creation of a youth bureau. I am a little disappointed, because we have been discussing the matter for months, for several years even, while our colleagues in the National Assembly have already taken action in this respect, perhaps because they had heard about our ideas or perhaps because their system works faster than ours.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as a Government, we shall very soon have to take a comprehensive view of the problems of young people. Band-aid programs are not going to help. How are we going to respond to the expectations of 600,000 young Canadians who will be looking for jobs this year in June, who will lose any illusions they had about society and the opportunities it was expected to offer, who will realize that their guidance counsellors have misled them and that in the final instance, society is telling them: Listen, you don't have any experience, so why not wait for a while. Wait until the labour market can provide alternatives. Wait until the economy gets back on steam. Meanwhile, however, these young men and women are more or less trapped. They are not entitled to unemployment insurance because as students, they cannot earn unemployment insurance stamps, and so the only alternative they have, unless their families can support them, is to go on welfare.

Or become a Member of Parliament, as my friend Mr. Maltais would say. In Quebec today, there are 75,000 young people who have to live on \$140 per month. You know, Mr. Speaker, on \$140 per month, you would be a lot thinner, and I think all Hon. Members would be hard-pressed to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, with a youth bureau, we would be able to develop a youth policy, once and for all. In 1970, the then Secretary of State, Gérard Pelletier, ordered a committee to prepare a study which was called "It's your turn", and that study has been shelved by the Department of the Secretary of State since 1970. Although I hope it will not take until 1985 before we start looking at the problems of young people, I do hope that 1985 will mark the culmination of a series of successful activities. I am counting on the support of my colleagues on this side of the House, youth being a subject that is very rarely discussed in the House, except by the Liberal caucus.

Our colleagues opposite talk about young people only when their Young Progressive Conservative delegates are in the gallery. Our friends opposite are only concerned about youth when they can make electoral gains, because they know it is not their traditional constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently ask the House to reflect on this subject and to take action. In the weeks to come, we shall have the Speech from the Throne. We shall also have, at least I hope so, the budget the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) has promised us. I am convinced it will be possible to instil some innovative thinking in the Throne Speech, and I know that the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne), the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal) and many others have submitted a series of proposals to the Minister of Finance that are aimed at easing the strain for these young Canadians who have been disappointed by economic realities.