

Procedure of Legislative Program

ernment's unique accomplishment in this field, an accomplishment we had looked forward to for so long. With any luck, Sir, an election will come soon. That will be followed by another kind of takeover session and I think most Canadians are looking forward to that.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, under the order the House made earlier today I shall have only 20 minutes in which to deal with the subject of the motion. This debate might be considered, I suppose, as a Throne Speech debate in reverse. I shall not have enough time to cover all the ground I should like to cover.

Mr. Stanfield: Call it a second look debate.

Mr. Lewis: I wish to begin by quoting briefly four passages from the Speech from the Throne. That speech grandiloquently said:

This country fails in its essential purpose if it does not ensure that its most precious resource, human talent, is not wasted away.

The Throne Speech sounded the bell when it said:

Job opportunities must be found and income uncertainties overcome if all Canadians are to share in the richness of this land.

They were fine words. The Throne Speech dealt with the north of Canada and it said, with a great beating of its breast, if a Throne Speech may be said to beat its breast:

—development will not be permitted at the expense of the northern peoples and the northern environment.

Then the Speech from the Throne announced the following:

Another step, and long overdue, consists of policies to ensure the equality of women in Canadian society. These will be announced this session.

We are still awaiting that announcement. The reason for my repeating these sentences, fine in spirit, banal in thought and meaningless so far as action is concerned, is this: the Throne Speech of last February was another example of the way in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his associates have tried to persuade the people of Canada over the last four years that they can look forward to real progress in achieving a decent, humane, human, just and compassionate society. All these adjectives the Prime Minister has used at one time or another. As I said in the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, anyone looking at the country today would be right in saying, as I did, that the Trudeau years have been wasted years.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Canada to look at Canada in June, 1972, and compare it with the Canada of June, 1968, when the people, with a great deal of hope, said to the present Prime Minister, "You look like a swinger; you look like a modern man. We will vote for you and give you power." Let us look at the country and see what has happened to this swinger in the last four years.

Unemployment in 1972 is very much worse than when the present government took power. Progress in housing has been almost negligible in terms of meeting the needs of the Canadian people for homes.

An hon. Member: That is not right.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Lewis: No progress has been made in setting up machinery for planning our urban centres and avoiding the planlessness, overcrowding and unmanageable pollution from which the larger centres in this country suffer. Consider pollution, a subject we discussed earlier today. In that area we have passed some laws which have not been proclaimed. We have passed some laws that were proclaimed, but the regulations have not been brought down. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Davis) has been attending a convention in Stockholm and playing the hero there. There has not been—I say this dogmatically, believing it to be true—a single significant step either to stop further pollution or to clean up the pollution of our rivers and lakes across Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: We are no better off in 1972 than we were in 1962.

Let us consider our young people. What has happened to the young people of Canada, many of whom supported the Prime Minister in the mistaken illusion that here was a man who might do something for them, who might break down the disenchantment they felt and bring to an end their feelings of isolation, alienation and that they were not participating in society. How has this Parliament, under the direction of the government, treated the young people of Canada? It has treated them this way: for 24 months, consecutively and continuously, between 40 per cent and 48 per cent of our unemployed people have been under the age of 25. Consecutively, every month for 24 months youngsters of 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and so on have left school, left college, left university and wandered across this country without a place in society, without any feeling that they are part of a social system to which they may contribute.

Consider all the bitterness, resentment and hopelessness which that kind of condition brings. Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about a thousand youngsters, I am not talking about 50,000 youngsters, I am not talking about 100,000 youngsters; I am talking about a quarter of a million and more young Canadians who are under 25 and who find themselves in this hopelessly desperate condition after four years of government by the swinger who fooled the Canadian people into electing him their Prime Minister.

Consider what has happened to the poor people. In any conceivable, real sense has their condition improved? Not at all. They still form approximately 24 per cent or 25 per cent of Canadians who live below the line of poverty. They are in precisely the same bind they were in four years ago; they are not one whit better off.

If you think of the independence of Canada, of the future of Canada as a nation standing on its own feet, what do you see? All you have seen in the last four years is a continuing erosion of Canadian economic independence, a continuing spreading of the foreign takeover of this country, the continuing control of our economy by foreign hands. The proportion of our businesses owned by foreigners has now become greater than it was four years ago. To answer this important, serious and indeed crucial problem affecting the future of Canada the government has brought down a bill that has no meaning, no relevance