

look on in envy as what is known to be the best country in the world becomes even better.

Hon. Edward M. Lawson: Honourable senators, my remarks will be very brief in the interests of time and trying to avoid repetition. At the outset, I want to congratulate Senator Everett on his comments dealing with western alienation, the issue of francophone voting and the effectiveness of the new Senate. I identify with and adopt his remarks as my own in the interests of saving time.

In trying to avoid being caught up in the wave of emotion and "bad Canadian-good Canadian" and "better a bad deal than no deal", and so on, I have tried to examine this question as I would a major labour contract that I was going to try to sell to the membership. If I took this agreement in this form, with the absence of all the detail, to the membership, before the meeting was over they would run me out of the hall and, at the earliest opportunity, would throw me out of office.

To add to the confusion, I find it difficult to understand that an option in an effective and elected Senate would be gender equality. I understand that this is a platform or a plank in the federal NDP policy, but does it really belong as an option here?

I read with interest Senator Carney's comments in the *Toronto Star* the other day. She said:

I would not want to run from a women's list of Senate candidates, as B.C. Premier (Mike) Harcourt has proposed. I've always run in British Columbia as a person, and I have won my nomination against men and women and I have won my elections against men and women. And I hope when the new Senate is elected, British Columbians will have the same opportunity to do that . . .

Premier Harcourt has stated that he wishes to have 50 per cent of the seats for British Columbia reserved for women and 50 per cent reserved for men. I do not like that idea because it is a quota system and a quota system is unfair not only to women candidates but also to voters because it limits their participation to a certain number of seats and limits their representation on issues.

Premier Harcourt did say that about ten days ago. A few days later he said that if you voted "yes" on the referendum, it was giving him a mandate to impose gender equality. A few days later, because of the hostility and anger of the population, he said that that was not carved in stone and did not necessarily apply.

After their retreat last weekend, one of the lady ministers announced that it was a done deal, that there will be gender equality. A few minutes later, Premier Harcourt announced that he was the premier and it was not a done deal.

Now that we have that clear, we can get on with the vote.

If they were going to make this an option in the Constitution, why did the premiers and Mr. Clark not have the courage to go all the way and have true gender equality? Why did they not limit the voting for lady senators to women only and for

men senators to men only? Some would say that sounds ridiculous. Perhaps it is, but is it any more ridiculous than the following scenario of what could happen?

We have an election on a particular date to elect six senators for British Columbia. Let us assume that the first three elected—one, two, and three—are new senators, men, and the next three are used senators like Perrault, Austin and Lawson. We are elected four, five and six. During the victory celebration Premier Harcourt walks in and announces that those who were elected four, five and six are to be replaced by those who were not elected but ran seven, eight and nine. The Premier then appoints them in our place, to be part of the new elected Senate.

I agree with Senator Fairbairn that during the negotiations someone ran out of steam.

I know that what Senator Pitfield and others have said is true, that there is a lot of tiredness amongst the population, that they want to get this deal over with and to get on with the Prime Minister's promise to deal with the economy and so on. However, I have attended a number of conferences in British Columbia. It may be because we have so many "hot-liners" talking about it, but the fact is that we have a very well-informed population that is very angry and think this is a bad deal, not only for the West but for British Columbia. They believe that we were badly out-negotiated. Whether that is our fault or the fault of the entire committee, I do not know. They believe that we are not fairly represented by the number of seats we were given. They believe it was a wrong decision to solve the problem of Western alienation by giving a greater concentration of power to Ontario and Quebec. There is considerable anger and hostility and they are going to be good and courageous Canadians and many are going to vote "no".

Unlike a bad labour contract, which you can renegotiate two or three years later to correct your mistakes, it appears that this deal will run longer than that. It may run forever, or even longer than that if we cannot agree on what "forever" means. So it is going to be very difficult to make those kinds of changes.

If I went into negotiations saying, "If we have any grievances or problems, we will resolve them with 337 management representatives and 62 of us, and we will take a majority decision to resolve your grievances in the future," they would probably go for a butterfly net and check whether I was certifiable.

There is a lot of anger and hostility. Surprisingly, there are an awful lot of Canadians who know what is going on here. I have recently attended two major functions involving large groups of people, and one of the groups was largely composed of Conservatives. Not one person there said they would support the referendum. One of the reasons they gave was that this new chamber will be far less effective than what we presently have. I think that is true. We have been totally emasculated. It will be totally ineffective and the people of Canada are aware of it. I do not accept that you are a bad Canadian if you vote "no". Being a Canadian means having the courage,