

a healthy one. All that needs to be worked out now is the method of procedure to be employed in this co-operative effort. It is the details surrounding such arrangements that are usually generative of so much friction.

It is further suggested in the white paper that a senator's term of office be limited, maybe to six years, with the possibility of renewal. What are to be the criteria used in determining whether a senator's term is to be renewed? Who is to establish these criteria? Who is to stand in judgment? I should not be surprised if the Government has no answers to these questions. It is notorious for not doing its homework.

All these changes that the Government proposes to effectuate in the Senate might very well be for the better. However, in my judgment this is a situation where gradualism should be the order of the day. What will have been gained if in our eagerness to refurbish our image we, in effect, throw the baby out with the bath water? Above all, let us avoid the evil of impatience.

In closing, I would say to the Government: Get on with the task of leading this country. Give up your role as housekeeper. Housekeepers are a dime a dozen, or at least used to be. Rid yourselves of your obsession with the diagnosis of problems and devote yourselves to finding solutions. Quit stalling, vacillating and waffling, and show us what this "Just Society" is all about.

Surely you have more to offer the public than white papers. The country does not want to see you indulge in a mere academic exercise. We want meaningful action designed to solve our problems, not to hide them.

Hon. Paul Martin: Honourable senators, I should like to join the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Choquette) in saying to the mover (Hon. Mr. Desruisseaux) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Everett) that they discharged their assignment with great credit to themselves.

[Translation]

I wish to extend my most sincere congratulations to Senator Desruisseaux for the speech he delivered here last Thursday. As always, it was the speech of a cautious, wise and able man.

I should like to say to Senator Everett that I thought his speech followed the pattern, in the reaction it created, of Senator Desruisseaux. They were two outstanding contributions. Senator Everett made, I thought, a

responsible statement, interpreting the mood of that portion of the country from which he comes, a portion of the country that feels oftentimes that it is neglected. That, of course, is not the case. But it is well that we should be reminded what people in Western Canada do think. No one has interpreted the relations of Western Canada to the rest of Canada better, in my judgment, in a long time than the speech Senator Everett delivered in this house on Thursday last.

I should like to say that I, too, regret very much the circumstances that have prevented the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Flynn) from being in his seat tonight. I join with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in expressing our sincere sympathy to Senator Flynn and to the members of his family on the passing of his mother. I am grateful to Senator Choquette for what he said about my own sorrow of recent days, something on which I am not anxious to dwell. Since it has been mentioned I should like to say to all senators that I am grateful for their kind thoughts in this situation.

And too, I agree with Senator Choquette that we owe a special word of thanks to His Honour the Speaker for the efficient way in which he presides over our deliberations.

I would like to congratulate Senator Choquette on the effort which he has just completed. He will not expect me to accept all the pulsations of that speech or to agree with all his conclusions. I must say that, having made a few speeches in opposition myself, I have had some experience about the merit of opposition speeches. Using that yardstick, I would say that in the absence of his leader tonight he credited himself with unusual distinction. He will not expect me to comment on all of the criticisms he made of the administration. I would like to say at once that I do take strong issue, however, with his statement that the Government lacked decision and purpose.

I have served in four Governments, including the present administration. Each of these Governments had its merit and its achievements. This Government cannot be characterized as one that lacks decision and purpose. The capacity of the Government to make decisions, and the fact that the Government has purpose, is reflected in the character and in the leadership of the man who heads the Government. If a government is lacking in decision and is lacking in purpose, the reason will normally be found in the person of the head of government. I believe that I reflect