

that Senator McCutcheon will have much more to say on this at a later stage.

But there are still other conspicuous omissions, even in respect of Liberal campaign promises. Where are the 10,000 university scholarships, and where is the guaranteed \$2-wheat? One wonders now how serious these undertakings were. The latter appears to have been pigeonholed indefinitely, whereas, apparently in lieu of the former, we are to have a Peace Corps along American lines. Similarly, we are apparently about to wage war against poverty, also along American lines. Honourable senators, nobody is against this sort of thing: everyone should of course be an Eagle Scout. What we are concerned about is the best way of achieving the maximum prosperity of all Canadians. The dialogue must go on this issue, and we on this side are not convinced that the present Government has the best answers, if indeed it has any real answers, to Canada's future.

Honourable senators, there are still other conspicuous omissions which I must mention. Here again I do not really fault the Government, because in politics unpalatable truths are to be buried, and if they cannot be buried they are to be ignored, and if they cannot be ignored they are to be dismissed lightly.

I say again that I cannot, in a political sense, fault the Government because it "accentuates the positive and eliminates the negative." This is traditional politics, though one wonders whether this is the "new politics" to which the Prime Minister once dedicated himself. All I can do is expose the omissions, which I suggest speak for themselves.

The matters which are not referred to in the Speech are honesty in government, executive assistants, furniture, the Seftkind bankruptcy, race tracks, dope-peddling, dope-smuggling, jail-breaks and international gangsterism. As I have said, as a politician, I cannot blame the Government for these particular oversights.

Now, honourable senators, I propose to run through briefly, and comment on, the main features of the Speech from the Throne.

I suppose we must leave to the House of Commons the reformation of its own procedures. All I can say is that I hope something will be done so that we will not have to await inordinate lengths of time for Commons legislation to reach us. We are all agreed that it is neither dignified nor efficient for us to stutter from adjournment or adjournment awaiting such legislation.

As to the Canadianization of the Constitution, we all favour that in principle. The

previous administration brought it almost to fruition, and I have myself advocated it as a measure necessary to the completion of Confederation. But we must be sure that the so-called Fulton-Favreau formula will not bring with it either the frustration of future constitutional growth or what has been termed by some the "balkanization" of Canada. We must study the proposal with cautious care, and not be dismayed by the allegation that it is based upon a *fait accompli*, an arrangement that, like a treaty, cannot be adjusted in any particular. After all, what has been done by one federal-provincial conference can be modified by another, if the adjustments are in fact in the interests of Canada as a whole.

I would like to see a joint Commons-Senate committee study the matter, and, in any event, it must go to a standing committee of the Senate.

The Company of Young Canadians is offered to us, apparently in lieu of 10,000 university scholarships, which do not now seem to have a very high priority. We will examine this proposal with interest, and I should think with sympathetic interest.

It is difficult to generate much enthusiasm for royal commissions or special committees of inquiry, some of which are foreshadowed in the Speech. All we can do is await their final reports, and see what the Government will propose as a result.

Amendments will be proposed to the Bank Act and related statutes. Though we have had a clear indication as to part of what is in store for the banking legislation, and perhaps could guess shrewdly as to the balance, we will have to await the specific measures.

Honourable senators, may I now refer to the unemployment insurance legislation, to which fleeting reference is made in the Speech from the Throne. The virtual bankruptcy of the Unemployment Commission Fund is attributed by the Gill Commission to two basic causes. One is the "gradual dissipation of the sound actuarial basis on which the original plan was founded" and the other was "the change in the economic climate which started in about 1957."

The Gill Commission pointed out that a plan which was originally sound, in the sense that it conformed to recognized insurance principles, has over the years become unsound.

The fund, which reached a peak of \$927 million on December 31, 1956, must now be