

On October 19, 1977, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) told the House that the federal government would also consider holding a referendum on the question of Quebec independence. This announcement comes at a time when the PQ in Quebec is preparing its referendum machinery. It is a time for all Canadians to become involved in the debate.

We will also be dealing in this session with several proposed constitutional changes which will ensure the strength of Canada's duality. Such a task will be long and difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I promised to be brief, and I shall keep that promise. In closing I would like the House and all Canadians to reflect for a moment on the following description of Canada given by Her Majesty the Queen in the Speech from the Throne. She said, and I quote:

Whenever I am in this wonderful country of Canada, with her vast resources and unlimited challenges, I feel thankful that Canadians have been so successful in establishing a vigorous democracy well suited to a proud and free people.

Speaking at Government House she said:

From the viewpoint of history this is the great Canadian achievement: not just that you have prospered, but that you have done so as a diverse society, and in peace.

In a world divided by differences of colour, race, language, religion and ideology, the Canadian experience stands out as a message of hope.

Canada, like any other nation, does have serious problems. Some are of a purely domestic nature, and some are due to external conditions which are beyond our control. As we begin this new session of parliament, let us not forget that we are here, first and foremost, to provide for the people of Canada good, responsible government. Our task is great, and though our problems are many, our resolve to succeed is limitless.

We will put to rest Canada's crisis of confidence.

**Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley):** Mr. Speaker, this has been a most unusual day in the House of Commons. It is unusual that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) can stand up and speak on a day on which one of the major industries for which he is responsible reports the largest lay-off since the end of World War II and have absolutely nothing to say about it. It is very unusual that the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), who represents the area concerned, should make the statement that he does not really believe that the natural resources industry needs support and encouragement in this country. What an unusual day it has been!

● (1622)

This afternoon I want to speak about the Speech from the Throne. I want to go through the ritual—because ritual is often much more important than substance in this place—of thanking the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne for their fine remarks. I do that with some depth of appreciation because, as I read the Speech from the Throne, I know that anybody who had to speak in favour of it had to use a great deal of ingenuity to praise it. Both members showed a great deal of ingenuity in their remarks.

### *The Address—Mr. Gillies*

It is a fatuous document, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing in it, which has become the hallmark of such speeches made by this government. It is really astonishing, at a time when people are asking the government and parliament to be a responsible forum for the conduct of the business of this nation, that the government did not even bring down a list of bills, an agenda for performance for the forthcoming session of parliament. We cannot look at the Speech from the Throne and assess from it what is going to happen in this country because there is so little in it.

We have to look at a troika of activities—the Speech from the Throne, the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the day before yesterday, and the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) last night to try to obtain some feeling for what the government is going to do about the great problems of our nation—problems about which there is very little dispute—the economy, national unity, and I would put as a third and very, very important problem, the reform of this institution. These three things are very much interrelated.

Canadians can take very little confidence from the speech of the Prime Minister. I disagree totally with the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collenette) because I suspect there has seldom been a time in the history of parliamentary democracy when the leader of a country spoke with such little analysis of the problems, with such little emotion, and with such little call to duty to the people of the country than was the case by the Prime Minister the other afternoon.

To say that the Prime Minister's analysis of our economic problems was at the level of Economics I is to do a great disservice to the teaching profession. It was well below that. There were some interjections to the effect that he was quoting Adam Smith, but he obviously has not even read Adam Smith very carefully. If this were not such a serious matter, a duo like Wayne and Shuster could take what the Prime Minister had to say about the economic problems of this country and make a fine sketch out of it.

The Prime Minister said that we do not need a new theory of economics. But he was proposing one, Mr. Speaker. He was saying it is our collective responsibility because of our collective guilt, that we are in economic trouble in this country. In his ten years of maladministration he has given us Marshallian economics, Keynesian economics, Neo-Keynesian economics, Galbraithian economics, and now he wants to give us Freudian economics.

A psychological theory of economic activity is what the Prime Minister is proposing because the fault, as Brutus would say, is in ourselves. The problem, according to the Prime Minister, is not the way in which this government has operated the economy but is among Canadians. They want too much. They do not work hard enough. We have not had theories of economics like this since William Stanley Jevons and the sunspot theory in 1870. It reminds one of 1930 when people sat around saying, "Don't worry, things are going to be fine if we just talk about prosperity." I have forgotten who said it this afternoon but someone did say that if we would just be optimistic things would turn out well. That is what people did