So I would ask my honourable friend to communicate with his friends in the other place and give them some instructions for a change. Instructions are always coming this way. Perhaps he could let the instructions flow in the reverse direction and propose to them—and that is a better word, perhaps—that the word they use in dealing with the matter should be "instructed" and not "authorized."

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, in the first place, I guess my friend was otherwise engaged when I said that in this case there were no instructions in either direction. I understand the position he has taken. My membership on that committee was so fleeting that I am unable to say with the same authority as my honourable friend what took place at the committee on this subject.

I suggest that we wait to see what the message says, and we can then decide what our feelings are on the subject of the operative verb. Since it is a committee that was originally proposed by a motion in the other place, with a resolution being sent here for concurrence, I think we should wait until we receive the wording of the other place, and then of course we can concur in it or not concur in it.

I do not propose to send a suggestion or instruction or-

Senator Roblin: Proposal will do.

Senator Frith: ----or proposal over to the other place, but----

Senator Flynn: You don't want to reverse the trend?

Senator Frith: —but I am sure that all of the questions raised and the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will be taken into account when the message is received, if it is received. Also, it is quite possible that I am mistaken or that the change suggested subsequently was accepted. I am not sure whether the word is going to be "authorized"; the word may very well be "instructed." Let's wait and see.

Hon. Heath Macquarrie: Honourable senators, there is another aspect to this. We must never forget that this is a joint committee, and that the members of the other place are, in the final analysis, creatures of the parent body, the House of Commons, as are our ten members in relationship to this parent body. I am wondering what the deputy leader, for whom I have a very high regard, has in mind in terms of the mechanism and the modalities for this chamber to advise, instruct, or suggest to our members on that committee as to the course of action they should take in respect of this very important matter.

As a member of the Senate of Canada, I would be somewhat offended if our ten most excellent members should be acting upon the instructions, advice, suggestions or orders of the other chamber. I think we must never lose sight of the importance of the expression "joint committee," and I had thought today, quite frankly, that the Honourable Deputy Leader of the [Senator Roblin.] Government in the Senate would have been proposing a motion, a measure, upon which we would give our considered, fair and objective judgment.

• (1425)

I am somewhat unhappy about the suggestion that we should, with languor and total relaxation, wait to see what they do in the other place. Our chamber is not always standing highest in the esteem of the public of this Canada of ours, as Mr. St. Laurent used to say, but if we ourselves contribute to this lack of regard for our own position, I think we are endangering our situation here. I would ask the leader to think just a bit more about this. We do not want our 10 among the 25 to be in any way subsidiary to anyone else's "diktat."

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, earlier in the day I considered and discussed with the Leader of the Opposition the possibility of our dealing with the matter and not awaiting, for example, a message from the other place. He and I felt that if we could deal with the matter independently of a message from the other place that that is what we would prefer. I did check into it and I was advised by the resident experts that in a case of this kind, involving a joint committee, it is usual to await the message from the chamber which originated it. In other words, in reverse circumstances it would be considered discourteous or against the respected practice to have messages cross, for example, or to not wait for the initiating chamber-be it this one or the other-to send a message asking for concurrence. For that reason I abandoned the proposal, which was somewhat like the one suggested by Senator Macquarrie, of bringing forward a motion on the subject. I was told that that would be contrary to the practice in the case of joint committees, and so I did not do so.

Hon. Louis-J. Robichaud: Honourable senators, last night on television I had the pleasure of seeing my former colleague, the former Premier of Manitoba, and now my colleague in the Senate. I think his question a moment ago was pertinent. Can the deputy leader tell us if this will come to the Senate in the form of a resolution, or in the form of a bill, which would require one day's notice? In addition, might it take three or four days before the matter is resolved here, or could we get a message from the House of Commons this afternoon? How is the matter going to be dealt with? In other words, are we going to have three readings of a resolution and have to sit tomorrow, as well as on Saturday and Monday?

Senator Flynn: What do you mean, three readings?

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I understand that the practice is not really unusual. It is quite normal for us to receive a message with reference to a joint committee and to be asked to concur in that message, and that is what is contemplated in this instance. We expect to receive a message from the Commons informing us that they have adopted a motion—whatever it may be—and asking us to concur in it. The message applies to a joint committee and requires concurrence by both houses. The chamber that initiates the joint committee normally initiates the message as well. In any event, according to the authorities I have consulted, one house waits