

undertaken too late, a larger part of the body politic having already been seriously infected.

That these revolutionaries were actively engaged in the first phase of their planned overthrow of our democratically-elected governments well over a year ago should have been obvious to this Government. If not before, then at least after the testimony of a man like Lucien Saulnier. If the proper steps had been taken at that time, the Government would likely never have had to employ the drastic measures it decided to enforce last Friday morning. If the Government had acted quickly, decisively and thoroughly upon the advice it was long ago given by a responsible, enlightened, political figure, the FLQ would probably never have had the chance to practise selective assassination and we would not now be living in a semi-police state, deprived of some of our basic civil rights.

Up to now this Government has amply demonstrated, I am afraid, that it was totally incapable of comprehending the magnitude of the problem in Quebec.

The report of the Royal Commission on Security pointed out that the main threats to the stability of our society were posed by the international communist movement and, more particularly, by some elements of the Quebec separatist movement. This Government, due to a singular lack of perspicacity or to a deplorable absence of fortitude, remained unconvinced.

Had the Government taken firm action when such was obviously necessary, the calamitous events of the past two weeks might never have been vomited into the annals of Canada's history.

I would like to have sympathy for the Government in the circumstances. It faced a situation which admitted of no easy solution. However, when I am moved to commiserate, I inevitably recall that it was this Government's reluctance to act several months ago, its stubborn, blundering, insolent and arrogant disregard for expert advice that led to the catastrophes to which we have been witness for over two weeks.

The federal Government has been guilty of inexcusable dereliction of duty as regards the question of revolutionary activity in Quebec. Either the Government was totally ignorant of the grave situation, or it lied when it claimed in the Throne Speech that ours is a calm, peaceful, placid society, devoid of all that grubby violence which afflicts many of the other nations in North, Central and South America.

I will have more to say later with regard to the sad events of the past couple of weeks—events to which we have accorded so much of our active attention.

However, I suppose that amidst all this chaos, amidst this violence and insanity, amidst these degrading acts of a degenerate few, we should, in order to maintain our equanimity, our sense of balance and proportion, force ourselves to turn our minds for a while to other matters that are themselves of no minute importance.

Convinced of the therapeutic value of such an exercise, may I be permitted at this juncture, honourable senators,

[Hon. Mr. Flynn.]

to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The way in which these senators discharged their responsibilities was little short of brilliant and deserving of praise, if not of emulation. Never has such wisdom, erudition and oratorical ability been wantonly wasted in praise of such an erratic effort.

[Translation]

Inasmuch as Senator Molgat is concerned, he is one of the group of eight senators the Prime Minister has just appointed, having refrained from making any appointments to this House since September 10, 1968. Senator Molgat comes to us with a long parliamentary experience in Winnipeg, having been elected to the Manitoba Legislative Assembly at the age of 26. He was subsequently re-elected five times, and was the head of the Liberal party from 1961 to 1969. His speech of yesterday is an indication of the valuable contributions he will make to our proceedings.

As for Senator Giguère, who came to the Senate on September 1968 as a member of the only other group of senators appointed by the present Prime Minister, a group which included the Leader of the Government and Senator Robichaud, he has already proved his mettle. He has perhaps not made many speeches here, but he has done fine work with the committees. After his speech of yesterday, I would suggest that he take the floor more frequently during our debates.

This session is the third of the 28th Legislature, and therefore the third over which you are called to preside, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell you how pleased I am to see you performing your difficult functions as mediator in our debates, which you always do most conscientiously and impartially. As you have experienced, the official opposition is always ready to co-operate with you in the application of our regulations, and will continue to do so.

[English]

As far as the Leader of the Government is concerned, I never know whether I should speak about him in French or in English. However, I insist upon calling him Senator Martin, with the English pronunciation, rather than Sénateur Martin, with the French pronunciation, for I know full well that this is an Irish name and should be so pronounced. Probably I will never cease to be jealous of the fact that he can translate his name into French, whereas I cannot.

The Leader of the Government was, during the summer recess and even more recently, very busy in his capacity as Acting or Assistant Secretary of State for External Affairs. He has just returned from a second trip to the Caribbean where he tried to repair or, more precisely, restore the image of Canada. I trust his mission will have proven successful and that the report of our Foreign Affairs Committee, upon which the members worked so assiduously during the last session, will also contribute towards establishing better relations between Canada and the Caribbean countries.

I should mention again the fact that the Government Leader represented Canada at the funeral of President Nasser of Egypt, whom he had been privileged to meet