

The leitmotiv or slogan, this year, is isolation— isolation created by social injustice; isolation created by economic difficulties; isolation created by geographical background. It would seem that all there is to do to straighten out the situation is to introduce legislation and Canadian society will undergo a substantial if not complete change for the better.

Jacques Maritain said:

One is always somebody's Oriental.

Along this poetic vein, may I suggest that in that case, one is always isolated from someone.

However, one should not confuse isolation and isolationism because, while the government pretends to fight isolation, one is not sure if at the same time it wants to oppose economic and political isolationism.

Another prominent feature of that Speech from the Throne, perhaps the last to be prepared by this government—and I think that most Canadians hope so—is to give credit to the government for all the good things which happened during the past few years. It tries very hard to have us believe that all the government's administrative or legislative undertakings have been sound and successful. On the other hand, it also suggests that the various problems facing the country cannot be ascribed to the blunders and omissions of the government, but merely to conditions prevailing in all industrialized countries, some compelling and unavoidable conditions for which the government should not be held responsible.

I am not saying this lightly; I invite anybody with a minimum of objectivity to read and reread the Speech from the Throne and find out that such is the meaning of it.

What I intend to demonstrate today is that, in practically all fields, no matter how many laws were passed and how much time the government and Parliament spent trying to improve the situation, little—too little—has been achieved. This government has shown itself to be particularly inept; its failures are much more numerous than its achievements, and in most cases the fault is but its own.

It is not a Speech from the Throne that can change the government's performance—and neither can a cabinet shuffle that is no more than a musical chair game. Incidentally, when the Prime Minister makes changes in the cabinet, he should occasionally give up his post to become an ordinary minister. That would be a real cabinet shuffle.

[English]

Honourable senators, the government leader, it is well known, greatly appreciates dedication to duty and an unquestioning willingness to serve the cause with zeal. Who among us will ever forget that rousing speech Senator Buckwold made in the course of the debate on the Income Tax reform bill? How edifying it was to learn that he was prepared to make all the sacrifices necessary in the way of time and effort to deal with that 700-page bill in the 12 days, counting Christmas day and New Year's day, the government had allowed

us. How touching it was to learn from the senator with the rolled-up sleeves that he was willing, magnanimously, to overlook the cavalier fashion in which the Senate was being treated by the government. How well do I remember the admiration in the eyes of the government leader as he listened with rapt attention to the words of Senator Buckwold. So, it came as no surprise to me that Senator Buckwold had been chosen to move the motion presently before us.

This bill, containing some 700 pages, was passed in less than a day by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, under the experienced chairmanship of Senator Connolly, with some prompting and coaching from Senator Martin.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): To which coaching are you referring?

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I did not say he was coaching the chairman, because that would be useless; I meant the committee. In any event, it did not detract one iota from the significance of Senator Buckwold's stirring efforts last December. Again yesterday, Senator Buckwold acquitted himself of his most important task with eloquence. I congratulate him without reservation. His erudition is surpassed only by his devotion to Liberalism—with a large "L". I have but one friendly warning for the senator. The government leader with whom he has had so many heart-to-heart talks—and this is what he indicated last evening—has a reputation for taking advantage of senators who are zealously disposed to defending the government. So, if he should find himself being lavishly complimented by the government leader, he may rest assured that he is about to be assigned some thankless task which more experienced Liberal colleagues have refused.

[Translation]

As regards our new colleague, Senator Renaude Lapointe, I was very happy, for her and the Senate, when the Prime Minister invited her to sit in this house.

As she pointed out herself last evening, I became acquainted with her at the beginning of her career in journalism in Quebec City at the time I was leaving that career myself to go into law.

Like all those who followed her successful career in Quebec City and later on in Montreal, as editorial writer at *La Presse*, I recognize what a contribution she can make here with her clear mind, her great learning and excellent judgment. The speech she delivered yesterday testifies to that.

On the other hand, I am sure she will forgive me for simply adding this: in her editorials—which I always read diligently—whenever she criticized a Liberal government, it was always in a spirited way, of course, but without ever concluding that it should have been replaced! In that respect, she has not changed and she probably never will.

I am not asking her to change for she will soon learn that in this house, there are many members who are making a valuable contribution while remaining extreme-