

whomever. Should it be with everybody? Why not have a committee with everyone? Why not have a committee of all of the legislatures and of the two houses of Parliament? Why is that ridiculous? It is ridiculous because that is not what the Constitution asks us to do. It asks all of us to do our job separately.

The other reason against it is that it just would not work. How could we have a separate study here, studying it in the Senate, and yet have some senators on a joint committee? What happens when they report? Perhaps they would report differently. What happens to those senators who are on the joint committee and who are also in the chamber? What would they say? They could say, "I am a joint committee senator, I am not a Committee of the Whole senator." It is just absurd.

So, there are two very good reasons why we should not do it. First, because it is not what the Constitution contemplates, and, second, because it would not work to have the two.

On the question of sittings, that, of course, would be up to the steering committee to decide. Senator Phillips knows that I am very much in favour of having Monday and Friday sittings of committees, and I see no reason why the committee could not sit on Mondays and Fridays, or Tuesdays, Wednesdays or Thursdays. I want to make it very clear—and if this is the point which Senator Phillips is raising; and if so, it is a valid one—that if Senator Phillips is objecting to the Committee of the Whole because he believes that it is our intention to limit the sittings of the Committee of the Whole to Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays when the Senate normally sits, that is not the purpose, and I put it on the record that that is not the purpose.

I thank him for the list. We have a steering committee, and it can decide on sittings. We will be grateful for that list of proposed witnesses, which Senator Phillips outlined in his intervention. I thank him also for reading the newspaper article regarding some scheme to undermine Mr. Turner. I welcome the opportunity to point out that the proposal for a separate committee and for a Committee of the Whole were advanced here before any intervention by Mr. Trudeau. The burden of the suggestion is that some senators are doing the work for Mr. Trudeau. I know that the senators who support this approach are doing it for themselves and not as a group supporting any cabal to undermine anyone. It is being proposed, as we see it, for the benefit of the Senate, and for the reasons I have described—namely, that the Senate has to play its own role given to it in the Constitution.

On the question of television, Senator Phillips has spoken on several previous occasions on the question of televising the proceedings of the Senate. I must say that he is entitled to the tribute of consistency—to mono-consistency. He seems to feel that the only reason why anyone would want to televise the proceedings in the Senate is because of the ego of the person proposing it.

Some Hon. Senators: Shame!

Senator Frith: Does the honourable senator hear his colleagues? I join with them. I, too, say "shame" for having that

[Senator Frith.]

as the only reason. I do not understand why he seems to think that it is only other people who, in their opinion, would show up well on television. We saw Senator Phillips perform today. It was a terrific act. I think he would have shown up very well on television today.

Senator Perrault: There's no business like show business!

Senator Frith: The honourable senator is much too modest if he thinks that the only reason for appearing on television is because of ego, and that somehow he thinks that his ego would not be so served. However, that is not the reason.

● (1540)

I do not understand any other reason for Senator Phillips to be opposed. I know he is not by nature a secretive or mean-spirited person. I know that his style is generous; that he is a populist, a true democrat, and for those reasons I ask him to engage that side of his character in looking at how television will aid the people of Canada in gaining access to the proceedings of the Senate on a very important issue; an issue that they are entitled to hear about.

We know that the greatest communicating device in modern times is television. For example, everyone seems to agree that television has done great things for the House of Lords. Therefore, I do not understand, when we are engaged in such important work, why we should not want to have the people of the country join in the proceedings in order to get the benefit of what, I think, is part of the role that the Senate should play in exposing matters of this kind to public scrutiny. I think we should welcome the opportunity to do so through the medium of television, in addition to radio and print.

Honourable senators, that leaves just a couple of points: The question of why, in 1982, we engaged in a procedure by joint committee as opposed to our present suggestion that we ought not to do so. I remind honourable senators that the situation in 1982 was not the same. For one thing, the amending formula that now exists did not then exist, and the formula that I have underlined and relied upon as a reason for us to take our individual responsibility is the formula that is contained in the pact of 1982. In any event, nothing that happened in 1982 should deter us from that acceptance of our responsibility.

The next question is: Will there be criticism? This is another thing we constantly hear. As senators, I am sure that we all understand that agreeing to become a Canadian senator is accepting a fundamental Catch-22, or dilemma, and that is: If one as a senator, or if the Senate as a whole, does nothing, it is criticized for doing nothing. The minute it does something, it is criticized by way of people saying: "How come you have the nerve to do something?" Therefore, whether we do things or refrain from doing things, we are criticized, and I do not complain about that. Anyone who takes this job has to expect that kind of trouble, because we all know that that is the role or the position that you accept when you become a senator. Therefore, as a result of that, when we do propose to take action, especially important action such as that which faces us now—and that is a separate study and a Committee of the Whole on this proposed amendment—we anticipate criticism.