

the country, had the Prime Minister chosen to give one, would have included those facts.

Senator Thériault: Do I understand Senator Murray correctly to suggest that the Prime Minister and the federal government should proceed without the consent of the provinces and have those rights entrenched in the Constitution?

Senator Murray: No, absolutely not; there is no justification for that inference at all. I was talking about the change in attitudes and the progress that has been made in the country in this field in the last ten, twelve or more years, and I pointed out the positions taken by the present Government of New Brunswick and by its predecessor in those matters as an example of that kind of progress, period. There was certainly no suggestion that the federal government ought to proceed without the consent of the provinces to amend the Constitution in matters of provincial jurisdiction.

Senator Thériault: What is the honourable senator suggesting that the Prime Minister of Canada should do to help those basic rights to become entrenched in the Constitution?

Senator Murray: What I was saying is that the Prime Minister of Canada, in the Speech from the Throne for which he is responsible, and in his own inaugural speech in this Parliament, has painted a picture of the state of opinion, attitudes, and the state of affairs in this country which, in my judgment, is unduly pessimistic and even apocalyptic. If he had wanted to give, as he should have given, a balanced résumé of the situation of the country he would have pointed to the progress that has been made in New Brunswick, Manitoba and Ontario, and attitudes generally across the country.

● (1600)

[Translation]

Senator Lamontagne: I admit Senator Murray has of course the right to criticize French-speaking federalists who are now fighting for the survival of their country, but I wonder why he did not choose to attack also those who are advocating separatism in Quebec and who are attempting to convince Quebecers by statements which are quite often false and dishonest?

Senator Murray: I leave such a task to the honourable senator and his colleagues.

Senator Lamontagne: Thank you.

Senator Asselin: Senator Lamontagne did not understand that Senator Murray more particularly referred to the statements on the CBC and the press made by the minister, André Ouellet.

[English]

Hon. H. Carl Goldenberg: May I clarify a point raised by Senator Murray? I understood him to say he feels that the Government of Canada should seek to entrench the language rights in the Constitution. I think I am right in that. That is what he said, and suggested that the Government of Canada has not tried to do that.

Senator Murray: I am astonished that the honourable senator should infer that from my speech. I am well aware of the suggestions and proposals that have been made by the Government of Canada for some time in regard to entrenching language rights. I pointed out two matters—one was a letter from the Premier of Ontario in September 1977, and the other was a long-standing proposal from the Government of New Brunswick—as examples of the progress that had been made. I said, as I have repeated several times since, that I alluded to those matters simply by way of saying that a balanced presentation or assessment of the situation of the country should have included reference to those facts. That is all.

Senator Goldenberg: I did not question what the honourable senator said. I believe I am the only one here who attended the Victoria Conference in 1971. I was there officially. We embodied in the Victoria Charter a proposal to entrench language rights, and it was only because one of the provinces refused to agree that that charter was dropped. If I misunderstood what the honourable senator said I apologize, but I think for the sake of the record it should be remembered that we tried that in the Victoria Charter. Also, there were federal-provincial conferences in 1978 and 1979 which were not successful, largely because the present Premier of Quebec would not negotiate and walked out. That is what should be remembered.

Senator Murray: Indeed, honourable senators, and that is the opposite of what the Prime Minister of Canada describes as Canadians slamming the door, one in the face of the other, and that is the opposite of what the Prime Minister of Canada describes as Canadians having unjustified fears about being threatened by another language and culture. That is a sign of progress.

Senator Goldenberg: I certainly agree with the honourable senator about the progress. I happen to know Canada very well, and there has certainly been progress.

Referring to his statement about the letter from Premier Davis—who, incidentally, is a very good friend of mine, and for whom I have worked at different times—I wonder why within his jurisdiction over education the premier does not take a stand on the Penetang school problem, since it is being used by the separatists in Quebec as a very strong argument against Canada.

Senator Asselin: Did you advise the Premier of Ontario to do that?

Senator Goldenberg: He did not consult me.

Senator Smith (Colchester): Senator Goldenberg has got a great imagination.

On motion of Senator Leblanc, debate adjourned.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

BOYCOTT OF 1980 OLYMPIC GAMES IN MOSCOW—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Nathan Nurgitz, pursuant to notice of Wednesday, April 16, 1980, moved: