

thing they wanted was payment in material terms. They wanted payment in aesthetic terms. They have that now. But I think what every young person really wants is the ability and the opportunity to express himself in his career. The suggestion in the motion and the presumption made today is that this is an immediate problem, it just happened because of the government's restrictive programs and it will go away as soon as things get better. This is a fallacious presumption; it will not happen.

If hon. members would review history they would find that as any community has become more sophisticated, the first group to experience problems has been the group between 16 and 25 years of age. Why is that? It is because with sophistication in any type of culture or economic enterprise there is a vested interest in those who have power. Let me put it in very clear and unmistakable terms. We are now at the stage of economic enterprise when a young person does not automatically learn to take a car apart and put it together again. He may have a great interest in cars and he may be very adept at mechanics, but that is as far as he will get because he will have to be an apprentice, a journeyman, and eventually he will have to join a tight little union or organization established to protect those with vested rights. So he will in time obtain part-time work, and if he is very persistent he will obtain more work. Then after seven or eight years, at age 26, 27 or 28 he will become a fully-fledged member of that tight little organization. Every society has its tight little cliques.

A few years ago it was not difficult to become a lawyer. All that was necessary was for one to become a clerk in a law office and after a period of time he would be called to the bar. Today one must be A-plus in every course established by a law society even before he can receive any training. One cannot be a doctor by apprenticing to a barber's shop, and so on. All these structures we have built up in our society are limited to those with vested rights, and it takes a long time to get these vested rights. Automation comes in and eliminates opportunities for young people to immediately take a position. This is where the frustration begins. What are they to do? Of course there is training and further training. This is one way in which we have postponed dealing completely with this problem. Further training puts young people in a position of not killing time but of making use of time until the economy finds room for them. The presumption is that if we get out of the immediate, urgent problem vistas will open up for all the young people. It will not happen because each industrial innovation, each trade and each industry becomes more and more sophisticated, with an increasingly smaller requirement for labour.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Therefore, we will have a tough time keeping people employed, even those with vested interests. When I say vested interests, I do not use it as a capitalistic term but with regard to a position, a job or a calling. People are having the same problem because there is pressure upon them to retire much earlier although they are capable of working longer. There is pressure applied at both ends of their working lives. Between the ages of 16 and 25 the

Employment of Graduate Students

situation becomes more and more difficult. What, then, shall we do? Historically, the answer has always been to fill the vacuum or void with the most urgent problem. In other words, over a period of many centuries and even milleniums the main problem has been in respect of military defence, and into this these groups were fitted. First it was an agrarian economy which then became a commercial economy and eventually an industrial economy, all of which faced this problem; and the military was always the answer.

This is what we heard from the hon. member who preceded me. Historically, defence has been the most pressing problem. In other words, the most pressing problem has been the expenditure of money to maintain this group. The question then is whether this will be justified today. There might be a saving grace in this connection. A report recently issued by the department of economics of the United States indicates that over 63 per cent of Americans are employed in non-productive work, that is to say, in service-connected industry. By that they mean managerial, promotional or sales jobs as well as architectural and engineering work. From the balance, which is 37 per cent, you take away the unemployed, which is 7 per cent, and if you consider the agricultural element you have a still lower percentage of people engaged in manufacturing and industrial work. The reason they have reached this very satisfactory situation is that they have looked upon other countries as hewers of wood and drawers of water.

We Canadians are filling this void for the Americans. In other words, we no longer merely dig for raw materials; we go a step further and we do the processing: we even do the manufacturing. But we leave it to the more sophisticated sections of the U.S. economy to do the managerial work. At the moment we are all happy because with the automotive pact we are kept busy. However, that will not employ all our young people, nor will it solve the problem. I suggest to the grey eminence, to the government, that if we are to solve the problem we must take a long-range point of view and the historical example, but instead switch to the most pressing need today. Defence does not enter the picture so far as Canada is concerned. Under no circumstances can we say we will build a military establishment to defend this country realistically. We are by agreement or by force of circumstance already committed to a joint defence program under the umbrella of the U.S. This is a fact, and wishful thinking or nationalism will not change it.

However, we could change the military structure to suit the most current and pressing problem that faces us, namely, pollution. This is a problem which now replaces what was once the problem of military defence. If one were to ask the average Canadian citizen what is the most pressing problem before us, whether it is defence of the nation or pollution, I am sure you would find that most people would say it is pollution. Why not, then, change our whole military structure and adapt it to solve this problem? We now have many vacant military establishments and a decreasing cadre of military people. We are stressing the importance of a change in emphasis. We gave the Emergency Measures Organization a trial run,