

In addition to the question of control in Canada, there is the question of the diversity of our trade which I think is just as important to our autonomy as the question of foreign ownership. If the great bulk of our foreign trade is with one customer, then our dependence on that customer, of course, has to be very substantial. The United States is an obvious market for many of our products, not only gas and oil from the west but many refinery and other products from the Atlantic provinces.

• (12:40 p.m.)

In terms of diversification, have we really been trying? At the moment I think we are doing pretty well with the European Common Market. However, in recent years our exports to that market have been growing at about half the rate of growth of imports into the European Common Market. Despite the importance of this, the biggest importing market of the western world, we have had no ambassador in Brussels since February. There has been no ambassador to the Common Market since February.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Stanfield: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) has been to Europe. I get the impression, from reading dispatches, that the significance of the Common Market, particularly the enlarged Common Market, is now becoming somewhat apparent to him. He is becoming aware of what this means to the traditional concept of multilateralism, namely that if the countries of the outer seven enter the Common Market the developed world will consist of two or three large trading blocs. Outside of these blocs, there will be a few relatively small countries such as Canada and Australia. The world might look quite different with regard to trading.

The minister indicated he would be making a proposal before some international gathering of some concept of agreement between Britain and the European Common Market. The minister has not disclosed any details. I hope he will give us his conception of this in the near future because, in my opinion, time is running out. It is time that we established on the record where we stand with regard to the European Common Market and the methods we are going to use to protect our interests.

During the last two years we have moved farther away from the just society. The slogan of the travel agent is that half the fun is getting there. In this instance, most Canadians would have preferred to stay home. We have had the constitution, regional disparity, growing unemployment, deepening poverty, no science policy and a housing failure. Two years have been lost with regard to the urban problem. We are now getting started on the problem of pollution. As far as Canadian autonomy is concerned, the government has just been messing around. It is time the Prime Minister indicated which decision of "Jumping Joe" is really the position of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: What we have been given in the Speech from the Throne is a grab-bag of thin proposals, ones left over from last year, plucked from other sources or areas and which have been laying around waiting to be picked

The Address—Mr. Stanfield

up. It is important to note there is no hint of a general philosophy or a general pattern. If the government really did mean anything by its slogan of a just society, there should have been a precise, recognizable pattern. The government, if it has a direction, should tell the Canadian people what it is. It should fit its acts and decisions into that pattern, because surely that is what a just society means.

I think the just society slogan has now become, justice if necessary, but not necessarily justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: We must recognize that the just society is just a slogan.

This was the year that the government had promised to reveal itself after two years of housecleaning and thinking. It has revealed itself. It has revealed itself as largely devoid of constructive ideas. The just society slogan is revealed in its emptiness. As a Canadian citizen I am rather sorry, but at least the position of the government is now clear.

There was one quite unpremeditated touch of realism at the end of the Speech from the Throne and I quote:

We stand on the threshold of greatness.

At first, I thought that was just another pretentious statement but now I consider it was really a reference to the Progressive Conservative victory in the next election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: In the Speech from the Throne the government has shown itself to be a fellowship of tinkers who believe that the basic things have been done and that it must merely adjust a screw here, tighten a nut there, or something like that. I do not think we have yet reached that stage. I do not think the Canadian people believe that either.

We realize, even if the government does not, that there is a great deal to be done. There is a challenge for the Canadian people to build the kind of country that they want. To do so, the first challenge is to rid ourselves of this government. Canadians must get rid of the government so we can really get to work, not just on slogans but on changing the reality of Canada. I therefore, move that the following be added to the Address:

—but we respectfully regret that because of the indecision and failures of Your Excellency's advisers, the Just Society is now a "distant ideal".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had a hunch the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) would not be completely enthusiastic with the Speech from the Throne. That hunch was justified this morning. He has spoken according to a traditional pattern, a feeling of being under obligation to disagree with everything in the Speech from the Throne, except perhaps with the Throne itself. I do not suspect him of downgrading the Monarchy or anything like that.

In his reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Leader of the Opposition was not entirely consistent and not funny throughout. It was better at the beginning than at