

the Government confirm that at a press conference last week, the Prime Minister of Canada stated in more or less these terms that, from now on, co-operative federalism was out. When he was in Quebec City, Mr. Lalonde added the following: In the future, we are going to spend our money and the provinces are going to spend theirs. What does this mean? If federal co-operation is finished, could the Leader of the Government inform us what kind of federalism we can expect in the future, since Canadian federalism is based on consultation and co-operation between the central government and the provinces?

[English]

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, I will take the question as notice and a full statement will be brought to the Senate so that no one can dispute this point. The days when the provincial governments are not responsive to federal initiatives and fail to credit federal initiatives are over.

The Honourable Senator Asselin comes from a province which has been the recipient of vast amounts of aid, approved by Parliament but initiated by this government. I wonder whether the honourable senator is suggesting that proper credit has been given to those who serve in Parliament for the type of federal aid extended to his province.

THE SENATE

RULES—SUGGESTED AMENDMENT

Hon. Richard A. Donahoe: Honourable senators, I have a question to address to the minister in charge of—what is it?—regional, industrial or economic development in the country—anyway, it is to Senator Olson, but with your permission, Monsieur le Président, perhaps I could make one suggestion before I ask the question. The suggestion was sponsored by Senator Frith.

On another occasion when we were proceeding merrily along, strictly in accordance with the rules of the Senate, he did not have the courage to make a motion to accomplish his end, but rose and said that it was his desire to suggest that some senator less conspicuous, some senator less accountable, should make a motion.

With respect to the discussion that has been going on about the rules of the Senate, I have a suggestion. I think the rules of the Senate should be amended; I think the rule should be amended to the effect that the lower the person to whom the question is addressed is cut, the longer he shall have to reply.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I rise on a point of privilege. Did I understand Senator Donahoe to say that he has some doubts about my courage, because if he did, perhaps we can find a way of assuring him that I do not think anything I have done in this house was done out of lack of courage. I hope that he did not mean to imply that.

Senator Donahoe: Until the day on which he rose and asked somebody else to do his dirty work for him, I had no thought

that there was any question of the honourable senator's courage, and I have none now, because—

Senator Frith: Here we go with another illustration as to why occasionally it is not valuable to have introductory statements to questions, although sometimes it may be.

Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition): You have had experience with that yourself.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, just on the question of my motivation for not making a motion with respect to the subject of Senate reform, I thought I made it clear that when I raised the question of Senate reform, I was raising it on a personal basis.

I was then, I thought, guided by honourable senators on both sides of the house indicating: Look, I don't think you can hold the position you hold and create the impression that you are not speaking for the government. That is why I said that I ought not to move that motion. It was not through a lack of courage, but simply on the basis—pointed out to me by my colleagues on both sides of the house—that it would not be proper for me to do so unless I were speaking for the government.

I hope that that is clear. Probably, I have not changed Senator Donahoe's mind. He thinks I am getting somebody else to do "dirty work", but I do not consider Senate reform to be dirty work. The only reason that I did not move the motion myself was because of the fact that I was told that if I did I would be creating the impression that I was doing it on behalf of the government. That is the reason and the only reason, and I thought everyone had understood that that was the right and proper thing to do. I am surprised to be accused of a lack of courage or of getting somebody to do dirty work.

Senator Donahoe: Honourable senators, when I rose and made my suggestion, it was only incidental to asking a question. I had no intention of provoking a debate. I can only say to the honourable senator who has just spoken that in this house we have had the example of a deputy leader rising to his feet and taking exactly the same attitude that was taken by Senator Frith. In other words, he said, "I am about to propose a motion, but I want it clearly understood that any motion that I make is not to be considered as a motion from the opposition or from the Conservative Party." Having said that, notwithstanding the fact that he is the deputy leader of his group in the Senate, I am sure you will recall, Monsieur le Président, that he did, in fact, follow that by the very gesture about which he had spoken—that is, of making a motion. I was struck by the obvious differences between the two leaders in this house, both of whom rose, said the same thing, and then acted in an entirely opposite manner. That is all I wanted to say.

Senator Smith: Deputy leaders.

Senator Donahoe: Deputy leaders, I beg your pardon. Thank you for the correction. It was the deputy leaders who made comparable statements respecting two motions, the substance of each of which was almost the same, yet both behaved in a diametrically opposite manner.