

Employment of Graduate Students

manpower training programs. Let me list some of them very briefly. There is the regulation which provides that a person must be out of school for a year before he can qualify for a course. There is the regulation that a person must be in the work force for three years before he can qualify for a living allowance, even if he is accepted in a manpower training course. What do these regulations do? They say to the young person: You simply cannot take the training even though you want to, even though there may be a need for the kind of skill which you wish to acquire, because you do not qualify.

We have said from the beginning that these rules are not only unjust but they are stupid. What is the point of saying to a young man of 18 or 19 who has finished high school and wants to take a course in a particular trade or profession for which there is a course available at one of our manpower training centres, a young man who in all likelihood is single and living at home, "You cannot take a course now because you have not qualified yet"? In all likelihood that young man has left high school and obtained an unskilled job. When he is 23, 24, 25 and sees that he cannot get a good, permanent and well paid job because he does not have the necessary skill, we say to him, "We will let you take a course and we will pay you a living allowance while you are taking the course". By that time the young man is probably married and living in his own home and it is costly to give him the manpower training course.

I am not objecting to encouraging married men with families to take the course, but I think it is obvious that we should not discourage a person from taking the course when he is young and single, when his living allowance would be much less. The government has been adamant in its refusal to consider this change although it has been recommended by people who work in the manpower training centres and have close contact with those who are taking courses and those who want to take courses. This suggestion has been made by such organizations as Frontier College, which has a brilliant record over many years of helping young people who do not have much formal education to upgrade their educational standard. Representatives of Frontier College appeared before the Senate Committee on Poverty and made such a proposal. The minister and the government know this is the kind of thing Frontier College has been proposing, yet time and again we get an absolute refusal from the minister to make this simple change.

● (9:00 p.m.)

The regulations provide that a person can receive a living allowance while taking a course of not more than 52 weeks, yet many courses offered in manpower training centres extend over two or three years. I wish to give one illustration with respect to one of my constituents who wanted to take a course in hotel management. People who travel across Canada, as do Members of Parliament on occasion, know how necessary it is that the training of people working in service industries such as hotels should be upgraded. So the manpower training centres offer a course in hotel management. We say to people,

[Mr. Orlikow.]

"You should take this course; it is a good course." Then we say to them, "But we are not going to give you the necessary allowance so you can spend two years on the course."

Surely it is time we stopped the policy under which the left hand does not care what the right hand is doing. Surely it is time we adopted a policy based on simple, ordinary common sense so that we can help people in this country, a large percentage of whom do not have the formal education required in the seventies to do the kind of jobs which, hopefully, will be open for them. Frontier College has estimated that 43 per cent of adult Canadians have less than a complete elementary education. Mr. Speaker, the 43 per cent do not even qualify for most of the manpower training programs offered by the government. We ought to be dealing with that problem, but we are not.

The government has to face up to the fact that in the winter of 1970 we have the largest unemployment probably since the end of World War II, and that a disturbingly high percentage of our unemployed are young people who have been led to believe that this is a country which can give a job to every person who wants to work, an expectation which the winter of 1970-71 is rapidly proving to be false. We have to face up to the fact that our manpower training programs, which have made tremendous strides since the former Conservative government introduced the technical vocational training grants—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Orlikow: That was a very good beginning, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind giving credit where credit is due. These programs have been improved, although there are glaring errors and omissions in some of the programs devised by the Liberal government. However, there has been very rapid expansion in these programs. Canada has moved from the time in the 1950s when we had probably the poorest record in the western world, in terms of manpower training, to a time where we are probably in a middle position in that respect. But if one thing is obvious, it is that in this period of major unemployment our manpower training programs, which were devised for a time when we had much more full-time employment than we have today, are simply not doing the job. Therefore, I call on the government to give serious consideration to sharply increasing the programs which are adopted so that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired unless the House gives unanimous consent for him to continue. Does the House agree to allow the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that the government needs to recast all its manpower training programs, not in light of the problems of the 1950s and