

In common with the Leader of the Opposition, I would be remiss if I did not mention the excellent reports of our committees. I do not agree with him in his concept of the contemporary role of the Senate. Of course, our function under the Constitution is legislative. It is also, however, open to us to use our time in investigation, scrutiny, and exploration serving the nation, just as was done in another day to a greater extent by royal commissions.

The Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce produced a report on the White Paper entitled "Proposals for Tax Reform" which recommended, successfully as it later turned out, the abandonment of the integration principle originally put forward in the Carter Commission Report. The committee produced three reports, as we know, on the 1971 tax reform proposals of the government. The Senate debated these reports, not for one, but for seven days, and the committee sat examining witnesses on the principle of the bill for a longer period than did the other place. Unlike the other place, it heard over 162 witnesses.

The report of the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media was published in three volumes. These were debated over a period of 16 days in this chamber. Honourable senators are aware that the public debate is still continuing on television, radio, and in the press. It may not be without significance that in Ontario the newspapers have actually set up a press council as was recommended by the Davey committee.

The Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, under the chairmanship of Senator Everett, in a remarkable burst of energy produced a well received report on Growth, Employment and Price Stability. That report has had a strong impact in the country and the recommendations contained therein and the evidence adduced before the committee do not support the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the government's program to control inflation. Senator Everett's report was debated here for five days, and I am sure that the debate will continue in this session.

The Special Senate Committee on Poverty, under the chairmanship of Senator Croll, produced its well argued report on Poverty in Canada. This has been well received by the public, and was debated over nine days in the Senate. I do not agree with the conclusion of the Leader of the Opposition, because if he will refer to page 4 of our proceedings of February 17 he will find a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne in which the Governor General is caused by the Government to observe:

It is the view of the government that the most important single factor in the attainment of individual dignity and active social involvement is the assurance of a secure income. Considerable progress towards the goal of a total income security program for all Canadians is achieved in the new Family Income Security Plan bill which will be presented for your consideration. The emphasis in this plan is on

[Hon. Mr. Martin.]

protection and is consistent with the Government's belief in the strong sense of self-reliance of Canadians.

In addition I may say that last week the Minister of National Health and Welfare announced that three pilot projects are now under way in western Canada in connection with the basic recommendation contained in the report of the Special Senate Committee on Poverty.

The Special Senate Committee on Science Policy produced the first volume of its report over a year ago. It was debated for seven days in this chamber. The second volume, as we know, was released one month ago, while we were not sitting. The chairman of the committee had obtained leave to issue a report during the period we were not in session. That report will be debated, I anticipate, some time next week. It is a cogently presented report, which has attracted wide attention. I look forward to an important debate on this subject during the course of this session. There is no doubt that the report of the Special Committee on Science Policy, whether or not one accepts its theses, has made a tremendous impact not only in this country but, according to my examination of the newspaper clippings, over almost all the Western world.

We are not all competent technically—and certainly I include myself—to make the type of assessment that should be made. However, I am sure we will all endeavour to fully understand the implications of this report and its meaning for some of our government scientific institutions. We must consider the type of development which will be required during the next decade related to such proposals as are envisaged in it with regard to industrial organization.

The Special Joint Committee on the Constitution has worked conscientiously during the past session. I believe it will table its report very soon. I may say that the members of that committee, according to my examination of the attendance and continuity of participation, have made indeed an important contribution. I do not know what the report will contain. There was an indication recently in the press, however, of some of its contents. In any event, I am sure that when we receive the report there will be an opportunity to consider it in the light of what we think should be done with respect to Parliament itself, not only the Senate but the House of Commons. There will also be opportunity to consider other matters relating to the Constitution.

So, we can look back to nearly one year and a half of productive work during the past session. I thank honourable senators for their co-operation. I feel confident that these qualities which characterize senators will be equally manifest during the coming session. It is not our fault if our work is not properly noted. As a matter of fact, it is not only the work of the Senate in the debates in this chamber that goes unnoticed. I find a great change in the treatment by the news media of the work of Parliament itself. This is a serious problem which should be examined by Parliament in co-operation with those agencies concerned with reporting to