

There was the Saulnier Report of last year. These matters were known to the Government. These matters were considered by the Government and by agencies of the Government established for the purpose of maintaining our security. The real fact is that the Government and Parliament, quite properly, was and is concerned about taking measures that interfere with the liberty of the subject. We did take strong action. I believe we were right in taking that action. I believe we took it at the right moment, and I believe we took it with a rather commendable display of leadership by the head of the Government.

I do not know exactly what was meant in the text of the Leader of the Opposition's speech when he said that the Government is incapable of understanding the problem in the Province of Quebec. I appreciate that there are some in our country who do not understand and do not fully appreciate the nature of that problem, but I am sure the Leader of the Opposition does not mean that the Government or particular members of the Government, including the Prime Minister, if you will, are not aware of the situation in that or in any other province of our country. I am sure that the steps that the Government has taken and the way in which it is dealing with this problem from day to day, reveals its deep understanding of the problem and its dangers. As time develops we will see that our unity will not be disturbed and our integrity will not be violated. I say this, fully conscious that the people of Quebec, themselves, are as strong in this determination as are others in any other part of Canada.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday suggested that he felt that the Prime Minister was no longer interested in constitutional review. I do not believe that that is the case. Constitutional review may be a very important instrument in bringing about greater harmony in the nation. It may be a greater instrument than we think in guaranteeing unity of this country. I do not know of any Prime Minister or any government that has devoted so much time to the question of constitutional review as the present Prime Minister and this Government.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: They have accomplished so little up to now.

Hon. Mr. Martin: It is true, as the Leader of the Opposition said, the various conferences of the provinces have not been fully productive. They have not been unproductive. They have not achieved what the uninitiated, who do not realize the complexity of the Constitution or its problems, such as the question of the entrenchment of language rights, Bill of Rights, and distribution of powers, hoped to achieve. These are complicated matters. No one really anticipated that there would be solutions in two or three years' discussion. When this matter was first discussed in this house we all recognized this fact, as did the Leader of the Opposition when he expressed the view that these discussions, these projected revisions on a global scale in the Constitution, could not be done overnight.

I hope that the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons will enable the Senate, as

well as members of the other place, to make a contribution to some of the deliberations which are now being discussed with the public so that the public can see the nature of these problems and how complicated they are and also see where out of the dialogue there can come suggestions for amendments and solutions.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday complained about the Speech from the Throne. I do not quarrel with his complaint, because it is an argument he has a right to make, even though I do not agree with its validity. He thought that the Speech from the Throne was in too general terms. Now, it is admitted that in the past most Throne Speeches contained a long recital of projected legislation, a long recital which added to the monotony of the instrument placed in the hands of the Queen's representative. I think that the Speech from the Throne this year was unique in that it set out the philosophy of the Government.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: That is exactly what I said.

Hon. Mr. Martin: That is perhaps one of the best places for the philosophy of the Government to be expressed and for the guidelines that the Government has in mind to be noted. For instance, speaking of our times, the speech said in part:

It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek ill-defined goals; an age of frustration as gentle men question impatiently old assumptions. It is an age in which the life-support systems of the biosphere may collapse unless man reverses his present course and begins again to live in harmony, rather than in competition, with his environment. It is an age in which the forces of science and technology now in motion are so massive, so swift, and so comprehensive that man may be facing his last opportunity to control his own destiny rather than be subject to it.

I admit these are words that traditionally come well from a man like Andre Maurois or Arnold Toynbee, but why should they not come from a government of a free people charged to deal with these very problems? These are disquieting words and we hear them discussed with increasing frequency, but why should they not be expressed by the Government?

Honourable senators, I would like to elaborate on these warnings and to demonstrate just what it is with which we shall have to deal in the years ahead: that is what the Government is thinking about. The Government is not only thinking about bringing in legislation to deal with specific matters, but it is also thinking about the long-term welfare of the nation, in the kind of world in which we live. The Government would not be discharging its function if it did not have a philosophical, as well as a political, range about these great issues. Complex industrial societies are reliant upon complex social and administrative structures which are vulnerable to disruption. We all know the truth of this elementary fact. We have bitter experience of its consequences.