

We are already getting under way with programs in the important area of marine science and technology, and I hope that we shall be able to play our part in any enhanced program at the federal government level. This area of research and inquiry is becoming of increasing importance to the support of life, including human life, and indeed to the survival of mankind.

My next point has to do with federal-provincial conferences. As our society becomes more complex and our federal-provincial problems become more difficult, the necessity for constant and continuing consultation between federal and provincial governments becomes greater. I am pleased to see that there is an impressive lineup of such meetings scheduled for the months and years ahead. Those meetings were listed in the Throne Speech.

It is important for the federal government to give strong leadership at these conferences. The rights of provinces are important, and are regarded as such by all provinces, perhaps more so by some than others. However, there are many problems in Canada which can not be solved by provincial action alone. Under our Constitution they can properly be dealt with only if there is a fair measure of give and take, of understanding, and agreement to share responsibility and to co-operate in implementing programs which are in the best interests of all Canadians.

At a later date I hope to speak extensively on the question of federal-provincial relations in support of post-secondary education. As honourable senators know, arrangements adopted in the fall of 1966 were extended for two years and will now expire in 1974, after which time new agreements will have to be reached between the federal and provincial governments. At a later date I shall make the point that Canada's universities should have a unifying influence on the country, and should be supported on that basis on a national level.

I am also pleased to see that conferences along these lines are scheduled to deal with such important matters as the report of the Economic Council of Canada, health care programs, housing, restrictions upon foreign ownership of land, income security and industrial policy.

My final reference is to that section in the Speech which referred to the Canadian Armed Forces. The following passage intrigued me:

The Government intends to widen the area of service to Canada open to personnel in the Canadian Armed Forces. In addition to maintaining a high degree of military capability as the primary and most essential role of the Forces, new emphasis will be placed on the many areas in which the varied skills and training of this large number of dedicated Canadians can contribute to the achievement of national goals.

I regard that as a splendid idea, and I hope that when we discuss the measures to be implemented we shall not be too hidebound by traditional attitudes. It seems to me that in times of peace we have a great body of well-trained and well-supported Canadian citizens who, in addition to maintaining a state of preparedness to defend this country in time of war, could serve many other useful purposes, augmenting the civilian forces of our country and contributing to the improvement of our standard of living and the quality of life in Canada.

• (2130)

These then, honourable senators, are some of the points made and policy declarations enunciated in His Excellency's Speech which seem to me to be of particular significance—indeed of particular importance. Others have remarked that the Throne Speech opening this session is a less philosophical and more pragmatic document than this Parliament has been accustomed to during recent sessions.

In my remarks I have also tried to deal somewhat more pragmatically and less philosophically with a number of specific items in the Speech. However, the Speech surely does underline the most important philosophical and national goals of the government—to preserve national unity and achieve equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

During the recent election campaign, the Prime Minister used the phrase, "The land is strong." Since the election, he has said that he overestimated the strength of the land because the election campaign brought to light some evidences that the goal of national unity had not been achieved to the extent that the Prime Minister thought it had, and certainly there is ample evidence that much more needs to be done before we can achieve the goal of equality and opportunity for all Canadians.

Nevertheless, honourable senators, I submit that this land of ours is strong, despite the tensions that exist within our society, and despite the necessity of taking stock of our present situation and striving even harder to achieve our national goals. This land is strong—very strong in many respects. We are strong in natural resources, our economy is strong, and the strength and the potential of the Canadian people must never be underrated. I have recently read a report prepared for the White House Conference on the Industrial World Ahead, entitled *The United States Economy in 1990*. The forecasts are truly astonishing, and I think it is safe to say that most economists and businessmen feel that the growth potential of Canadian business and the Canadian economy during the next two decades may even exceed that of the United States. The article in the Bank of Commerce letter to which I referred earlier is confident and, for a bank, even optimistic about our immediate prospects in the year ahead. This is only one of many similar forecasts by economists and businessmen.

Let us then make the fullest use of our resources, both human and material, and continue to strive toward the twin goals of national unity and equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

The people of Canada are entitled to expect this from their national government and their national Parliament, and we ought not to allow any other considerations, here or in the other place, to deter us from giving a good account of ourselves to the nation and to its people whom we serve.

[Translation]

Hon. Paul C. Lafond: Honourable senators, faced with the honour of seconding the motion on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I feel quite incapable of attempting to make a learned and thorough analysis of it. It would also be that much more difficult after