

**Senator Frith:** Let us have it clear on the record what the wording is. It may be that the political leaders "have to do this" or "have to do that". However, in the meantime, citizens, assuming they have gone to the trouble of obtaining a copy of the Consensus Report, and we hope they will have, are being asked to say "yes" or "no" to a package that provides that an elected Senate would have the constitutional power to ratify the appointment of the Governor of the Bank of Canada "and other key appointments made by the federal government".

The word "and" is quite important there. Mr. Clark has touted this as a significant, and I think he said "real", power for the Senate. But the draft legal text dilutes that power, specifying only the power to ratify the appointment of the head of the central bank while Parliament "may" provide for others.

There is a difference between saying "Bank of Canada and other key appointments" and saying "Bank of Canada and Parliament may". It can be, and is, important to the citizen who is asking.

I made it clear in my speech, as did others, that it is very important for us to be as forthright, open, and detailed as we can in this historic referral to the people of this issue. I take it that nothing is going to happen between times to tell them that this is what will happen, that Parliament "may". Are we going to say to them: "When we, the political leaders, asked you to say "yes" or "no" to a package that provided for the appointment of the Governor of the Bank of Canada and others, it will not be that. It "may" apply to other appointments, if Parliament ratifies it."

I am not saying that that is a wrong result, but I think the people are entitled to know which it is, and this is only one example.

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, I think the intention of the 11 first ministers, two territorial leaders and four, I think it was, aboriginal leaders is clear enough. They are putting to the people of Canada, in a referendum, a power for the Senate to ratify the appointment of the Governor of the Bank of Canada and certain other, as yet unspecified, federal government appointments. That is what they are asking the people of Canada to approve in the referendum.

**Senator Frith:** No, "maybe certain others" not "and". "And" is the present.

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, as I said already, various draftsmen can scribble away, but the second paragraph of chapter 15 on page 6 of the Consensus Report says:

The Constitution should also be amended to provide the Senate with a new power to ratify other —

— and I say, as yet unspecified—

— key appointments made by the federal government.

I think that is enough.

**Senator Frith:** I take it, then, the answer is that the people who want to know exactly what they are voting for, either "yes" or "no", will be told that that is what we are asking, but

that there may be some scribblings. It seems to me the scribblings in this case could make quite a change.

Another point I raised in my speech on this subject is the importance of not threatening or using scare tactics in our explanation to the people. I want the minister to respond to a step that is being taken—which I think is a wrong one—in the education of Canadians about this agreement.

In particular, I quote the Constitutional Affairs Minister, Mr. Clark. He said:

When the (United Nations) . . . looks at all other countries and says this is the best place in the world to live, we should take that seriously.

And we should recognize that, once, Beirut was one of the best places in the world to live, and it gave in to anger—that so many of the things that we see on the news today used to be whole communities until they gave in to anger.

That could happen here.

Now that seems to me to be a threat that a "no" vote could result in a civil war, or at least the kinds of things that we have seen happening in Lebanon.

Is this just an accident or is it the government's intention? That seems to me to be hiding behind a debate of fear, employing scare tactics at every opportunity and bringing up the possibility of a civil war. That is short of what I understood the Leader of the Government to mean, and certainly what I meant when I spoke of our obligation as political leaders to educate the people. I do not think that is the kind of education either he or I had in mind. Is it what he had in mind?

**Senator Murray:** During the debate I endorsed quite warmly what the Leader of the Opposition had to say in that regard. I continue to believe that our chances of winning this referendum are infinitely greater because our case is so much stronger when we put before Canadians the benefits of a "yes" vote.

As for Mr. Clark, the Leader of the Opposition perhaps has not seen statements attributed to him within the last 24 hours in which he said that he felt it was a misinterpretation of his remarks to suggest that violence and civil war would be the result of the rejection of this Charlottetown consensus.

He had made the point, however, that the recent and not so recent history of the world is tragically littered with cases of countries that were once strong and united but gave in to factionalism and division and were unable to maintain their unity, and that the result has been very disadvantageous to their peoples economically, socially, politically and with regard to the influence of those countries in the world.

However, he has elaborated on that statement within the past 24 hours and I saw a quotation to that effect in the Montreal press this morning.