

ty-one per cent of Canadians said it should. And on minority language rights, Madam Speaker, the figure was 81 per cent.

Those are the figures we found last August. Have they changed substantially over the months in spite of the debate which went on, or perhaps because of it? Let me read from the *Toronto Star* of January 8, Madam Speaker. The answers to the questions asked are tabulated as follows: 83 per cent agree that the Constitution should include a charter of rights and freedoms; 70 per cent agree that it should include an amending formula to be reached over the next two years, and any changes to the Constitution before then would need the unanimous consent of the federal and provincial governments. Seventy per cent agree with the very proposal in the resolution before the House, Madam Speaker: two years of debate and consultation between the federal government and the provinces, during which time unanimity would prevail.

Another survey published by the *Calgary Herald* on November 19, 1980, which covered 1,400 households in the western provinces and was carried out by the Canada West Foundation found that while westerners are solidly opposed to the method being used to change the Constitution, they are willing to endorse the basic features of the federal government's constitutional package.

Asked whether the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in the package should be binding on both levels of government, 78 per cent agreed and 11 per cent disagreed.

Finally, Madam Speaker, referring to a survey apparently commissioned jointly by the *Edmonton Journal* and the *Regina Leader-Post*, published in the February 21 edition of the *Journal* and March 14 edition of the *Leader-Post*, the question was asked: "Would you like the patriation of the Constitution to be done in the next six months, the next year, the next two years or the next three years?" In Saskatchewan, Madam Speaker, fully 81 per cent wanted patriation to take place either during the next six months or the next year; in Alberta, the figure was 63 per cent, and in British Columbia, 71 per cent. In all cases, whatever part of the country we look to, there is a clear majority in favour of patriation.

As to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, because this is a sensitive question with our opposition the question was asked: "Should the charter be included before patriation, after patriation or not at all?" The answers: In Saskatchewan, before patriation 70 per cent; in Alberta, before patriation 55 per cent; in British Columbia, before patriation 56 per cent.

The Canadian people, Madam Speaker, are not afraid of this tag of colonialism which has been attached to this action of Parliament by the opposition. They are right, and I will explain later why they are. However, for the time being, I am merely talking once again to the substance of the issue and indicating that the Canadian people want a charter. The hon. member for Provencher said on behalf of his party that the Canadian people want a charter, and every political party represented in this House is on record as wanting a charter.

In the case of the Conservative Party, it goes back to the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker who, when he moved a bill of

### *The Constitution*

rights binding only at the federal level, deeply regretted that he could not make it binding on the provinces because they would not agree. That would have been the ideal, and he clearly says so in his memoirs "One Canada", published in 1975. And if we look at the position of the official opposition as shown by the resolutions adopted by that party at last month's general meeting, it is clear that they, too, enthusiastically endorse the inclusion of a charter in the Constitution.

The position of the New Democratic Party was also made clear by the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) when on February 23 he spoke in this House and said, as reported on page 7593 of *Hansard*:

I should like to say a few words about the suggestion of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and certain other Conservative members that a bill of rights is something new and that this is a recent decision made by one man who is attempting to foist his views on Canada.

The hon. member for Burnaby recalls that in 1960 there was the Diefenbaker bill of rights, but:

... in January of 1959, the then premier of Saskatchewan, Tommy Douglas, wrote the then prime minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, saying that the time had come for a constitutional amendment in this country to entrench fundamental rights and freedoms.

I am told, Madam Speaker, that the Hon. Tommy Douglas is in the gallery.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am happy, as all hon. members are, to acknowledge his presence in this House where he will always be a welcome guest. I just wish he would spend a little time with the present Premier of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member for Burnaby goes on to say this:

So, it was not the present Prime Minister who was the great pioneer in this area. If anyone was a pioneer, it was Tommy Douglas who fought in 1959 to entrench these fundamental rights in the Constitution of Canada.

And finally, Madam Speaker, I can say with some modesty that our party, during the period of the 1970s, is on record as to the substance of these matters. One can refer to the newsletter of January and February, 1981, and see, particularly at the Winnipeg convention of 1980, that we are clearly once again on record for patriation and entrenchment of a charter. Therefore, all the political parties, and certainly the joint committees of both Houses of Parliament representative of all members, first in 1972 and then in 1978, are clearly on record as saying that a charter should be entrenched in the Constitution.

● (1600)

Of course, this is also true of the recommendation of the joint committee of 1981, the one made public just a few short weeks ago, which unequivocally stated that a charter should be in the Constitution. In that regard, I found an interesting statistic in an article in the *Catholic Register* yesterday written by the hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appoloni) which shows that 54 groups out of 75 appearing before the joint committee were in favour of entrenching a bill of rights.