

Unemployment among Youth

turn back the laws of economics to the time when 70 per cent of the population in this country lived and worked on farms at the beginning of the century. It is now about 10 per cent of the population. I would hate to question these economics, when the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and others of her party get up on the "late show" and question the cost of food, if we hope artificially to stimulate in a non-economic way the cost of producing food. I do not know about the dairy farmer: I think he faces some "udder" frustrating situations; I suggest he is on the horns of a dilemma.

The hon. member spoke about foreign ownership of land. That is an interesting point, because his Saskatchewan government considers any land owned by people outside that province to be foreign owned. That would make René Levesque look like a federalist. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales), who preceded the hon. member for Assiniboia—

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is the hon. member rising for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Knight: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danson: I would like to continue, Mr. Speaker, because my time is so short. If there is time at the end of my speech, I would be delighted to answer the hon. member's question. The hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Wellington referred to an ad hoc approach. I suggest it is a very flexible and responsive approach, responding to the reasons which the hon. member for Wellington gave, such as lack of ability to project into the future. I disagree with him that the Company of Young Canadians has disappeared. I think it has found its role. Mistakes were made, they were seen to be mistakes by the government and the CYC was reorganized. We think it has disappeared because it is operating efficiently and quietly. These are the flexible and sensitive approaches which a responsive government takes.

The hon. member pointed out that there may have been some conflict in municipalities. I know that when the Opportunities for Youth and LIP programs were first presented I spoke to the community leaders in my constituency. They were delighted not to interfere. They realized the scope of the project and that we could achieve co-ordination as we developed more experience in these types of programs. We cannot expect perfection, but we are making progress.

The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) referred to the book entitled "Future Shock." It is interesting to note that in "Future Shock" Toffler says: "In dealing with the future it is more important to be imaginative and insightful than to be 100 per cent right." I think it is terribly important that that be the principle. If we work until everything is perfect and we cannot make mistakes, we usually end up, to use the cliché, with too little and too late. We must be prepared to experiment and make mistakes.

I wish to quote from a lead editorial which appeared in the June 10 edition of the *Financial Post*. It refers to LIP

[Mr. Danson.]

which was started in a hurry and mistakes were made. The article reads in part:

The success of LIP is now well documented and it is easy to understand why manpower minister Bryce Mackasey should want to see it continue in some form far into the future . . . At a time when jobs were needed, it created an impressive 92,000. Perhaps even more significant, almost half of the people involved in the program were removed from the ranks of those drawing unemployment insurance or receiving welfare.

It is interesting and significant that a financial journal should say this. The editorial continues:

• (1740)

To a whole generation of young adults who had been bombarded with anti-establishment views, here was the establishment coming to them on their own terms and providing the funds needed to carry out projects that the young felt were important and valuable. Young and not so young found themselves working side by side, and getting satisfaction from it.

I think this is very significant, because I have the impression that when the history of the period is recorded, one of the greatest accomplishments of this government will prove to have been its ability to participate, to "tune in" a whole generation of youth which had been disenchanted by and alienated from the structure of society in all its forms, including government. Now, instead of opting out they are opting in. Government was responsive to their needs and they in turn responded nobly.

I hope this is not a caucus secret among my hon. friends, but when this matter was discussed in the early stages I know many of us felt severe criticism would be forthcoming, that mistakes would be made, that misunderstandings would arise. And I was proud of my colleagues in caucus when, having recognized that mistakes might be made, they agreed to go ahead nevertheless because they believed it was right to do so, and take the flak if the flak came. And the flak did come: it came at the beginning; but as the program developed and the thoughtful people saw what was happening—I am not talking about the stupid people who refuse to look further than long hair and shaggy beards and floppy hats—they applauded these projects.

When I hear of a project in my own constituency or in the Toronto region which is criticized in the press, in letters written to the editor or in letters which I receive, I investigate each case individually; and I have yet to find one which was not serving a very worth while purpose, not to perfection but doing a useful job.

I agree with the hon. member for Wellington in two respects. As the father of four sons, I believe counselling is of primary importance and I like the priority he places on it. I agree, too, on the importance of trying to determine the direction in which the whole of our society is moving. As to our ability to project future trends, there are areas in certain disciplines in which we can forecast when shortages will arise. But there are many other areas where projections made today would not be valid in ten years. The velocity of change has been so great that we can well remember when society seemed to turn itself around every 20 years, then every ten years and, later, every five years. Now the rate of change is so fast that I suggest it does so in even less time.