

would be kind enough to explain to us where they would like the cameras located.

**Senator MacEachen:** I have been impressed with the British Tories and Lords who love TV. That is my inspiration.

**Senator Phillips:** What rules will guide the television cameras? Will they show the whole Senate, as my friend Senator Roblin once expressed it, warts and all, or will we be limited to the benefit of seeing one senator only? Will the camera focus on one senator, and switch to the witness when the response is made?

● (1510)

**Senator Marshall:** Will they just focus on the empty seats?

**Senator Phillips:** Perhaps we could invite some of the staff in to fill the empty seats. That may be the answer.

**Senator MacEachen:** It would be better to bring senators in.

**Senator Phillips:** Recently I attended a meeting of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources when it was considered essential to televise the proceedings. There were six cameras, three along each side of the table, and there was hardly room for senators. Let us bear some of these things in mind when we are satisfying the ego of the honourable senators who want to appear on television.

Honourable senators, we should consider what will happen if the Senate refuses to join in a joint committee that will probably be proposed by the government. You will remember that the Senate participated in a joint committee in 1982 when the Constitution was being developed. I think honourable senators made a worthwhile contribution to that committee. I would be curious to hear from the honourable senators opposite as to why a joint committee was desirable in 1982 and is not desirable in 1987.

Senator MacEachen expressed the viewpoint that the Senate should not join in a joint committee because the Senate has no veto over constitutional amendments. Is the honourable senator suggesting that the Senate in Committee of the Whole would have a veto? Is anyone going to pay any more attention to the views of the Senate in Committee of the Whole than they would to a joint committee?

**Senator MacEachen:** Yes.

**Senator Frith:** Next question.

**Senator MacEachen:** That is a clear yes, because senators could not express their views in a joint committee where the majority would be from the House of Commons.

**Senator Phillips:** Senator MacEachen is suggesting that the Senate did not make its views clear or that they were ignored in 1982. I do not think that is the case at all.

The Senate would probably have five members on the joint committee. I am not trying to coach Senator MacEachen and suggest who he would want to nominate, but let us consider the nomination of Senators Frith, Gigantès and Stewart, as an example. Is he suggesting that those three senators are so mediocre in their talents that they would not be able to influence a joint committee? I do not believe that at all. I

think those three gentlemen would make an impact on that committee, and one that would be worthwhile hearing. I could suggest Senators Kirby, Pitfield, Argue or Austin, and certainly all of those individuals are capable of making their views known.

Another advantage of the joint committee would be that it would, doubtless, have TV coverage, and if the honourable senator is interested in TV coverage, he can get it in that joint committee. He does not need TV cameras in here.

**Senator MacEachen:** I might change my mind. That is the best argument yet.

**Senator Phillips:** The committee would also, doubtless, invite former Prime Minister Trudeau. If you want to hear from Mr. Trudeau, I am sure you can do that in the joint committee.

**Senator MacEachen:** Are you ready for Babushka?

**Senator Phillips:** Can honourable senators imagine the former Prime Minister refusing to appear before a joint committee because he wants to appear before the Senate? That would be a very unusual step for the former Prime Minister to take. I would fully expect that, having established a joint committee himself, he would prefer to appear before the joint committee. That only seems logical. I think the honourable senator is being very unfair to the former Prime Minister to even suggest he should appear before the Senate and not before a joint committee.

Again, honourable senators, I say that there is no objection to studying the Meech Lake accord. My concern is that the Senate would refuse to participate in a joint committee. If that be the case, honourable senators, consider the criticism. A number of senators are now sensitive about the criticism received by the Senate. We have not heard any criticism yet. Let the Senate refuse to join a joint committee and listen to the justified criticism that will undoubtedly occur.

The Senate is supposed to represent the provinces. May I remind the Senate that it was the federal government and the governments of the ten provinces that agreed on and urged examination of the Meech Lake accord, and they agreed upon a joint committee.

Honourable senators, I hope that the Senate will still consider a joint committee, and that it will participate in the proposal which will undoubtedly be made by the government. It is a proposal that has been approved by the federal government and the ten provinces. Surely the Senate is not going to be the odd man out.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. John B. Stewart:** Would Senator Phillips permit me to ask a question? He said many controversial things and he made many points with which I would disagree completely, but towards the end of his speech he made one point which I think he would want to clarify. As I recall, he said that senators represent the provinces, and that the premiers of the provinces have already indicated quite emphatically where they stand. Does he really mean to say that senators are here