

the government. It is common knowledge that the Quebec government does not have the money that will be required to complete the project. In fact, the estimates of the cost of the project range from \$5 billion to \$10 billion, and that in itself proves that the planning has been less than adequate. I may state here that in 1964 the Kierans report estimated the cost at between \$2½ billion and \$3 billion.

• (2140)

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government will be required to bail out the project with tax money from other provinces to avert a possible or probable disaster. I do not want to wait until that happens. I should like to speak of some of the benefits of the grand canal suggested by the Kierans report—new waters to the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers; water for the power industry, navigation, ports, shore property protection, fisheries and recreation; water for consumption, such as municipal water supplies, industrial uses and agriculture. New water from the grand canal system would offset withdrawals from the Great Lakes; new electric power could be fed into a national power grid to handle peak load periods; inland navigation, using ships for cargo and passenger service could extend from Montreal through the Great Lakes and into the Atlantic Ocean from Hudson Bay. In addition, the grand canal project, as a joint federal-provincial venture, would promote orderly development of a large and wealthy area of the Canadian north.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech contains a statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that reads as follows:

Our goals and hopes are bound up in the restlessness and vitality of this rich land.

I am in agreement with the Prime Minister that we have a rich land, Mr. Speaker, but I add to that statement that our wealth is so badly managed by the present government that the restlessness he speaks of is not a good sign, as he implies, but a bad sign. It is a sign that people in this country are fed up with deprivation and lack of opportunity in a country that has the potential to be a great nation. People are restless because they have been deceived and misled. People are restless because they not only cannot find jobs but they cannot even get assurances from their government that it is even the least bit interested in their plight. People are required to leave the work force before they feel that they are through contributing, and are forced to exist on inadequate pensions for the remainder of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Throne Speech would contain some indication that this government would consider abandoning a few of its costly and wasteful give-away programs and divert that money to the more humane and more practical purpose of increasing pensions and supplements to the elderly. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Throne Speech would provide some ray of hope to those of our citizens who aspire to something more than a mere existence. I had hoped that the government would at long last abandon or at least

25020—81

modify its disastrous experiments with our economy and chart a course toward fiscal reality.

We need programs that will stimulate the economy and restore the confidence of Canadians in their own system. We need a revitalized economy, because that is the only way new jobs can be created and present jobs preserved. The Prime Minister stated in the Throne Speech that the government would double its past efforts in the fight against unemployment. Last year those efforts created 57,000 new unemployed. It would appear that the goal for 1972 is to be 114,000 new unemployed, if we are to go by the government's past record.

The future of Canada is in serious doubt, Mr. Speaker, and I say this knowing that the Prime Minister will call me a prophet of doom, as he has called my leader.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. It being 9.45 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38(3), to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith any amendment now before the House.

• (2150)

[English]

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (M. Lewis) which was negated on the following division:

(Division No. 1)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken	Laprise
Alexander	La Salle
Asselin	Latulippe
Baldwin	Lewis
Barnett	MacDonald (Egmont)
Beaudoin	MacInnis (Mrs.)
Bell	MacKay
Benjamin	McCleave
Burton	McCutcheon
Carter	McGrath
Coates	Moore
Crouse	Muir
Danforth	Nesbitt
Dinsdale	Noble
Douglas	Nowlan
Downey	Nystrom
Fairweather	Orlikow
Flemming	Peters
Gauthier	Ritchie
Gilbert	Rodrigue
Godin	Rowland
Harding	Scott
Hellyer	Simpson
Howard (Skeena)	Skoberg
Howe	Southam
Knight	Stanfield
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Stewart (Marquette)
Korchinski	Thompson (Red Deer)
Lambert	Woolliams
(Edmonton West)	Yewchuk—59.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand	Basford
Andras	Bécharde
Badanai	Beer