

motion, and that votes that are lost should go back for revisions.

Aboriginal self-government should be studied in more detail. Interprovincial trade barriers should be eliminated and property rights should be enshrined. The federal government should also retain its jurisdiction over the environment. Difficulties could be encountered with some of these issues. However, my constituents wish to see parliamentarians study them more carefully.

Freedom of speech and opinions are important to Wild Rose constituents, and they welcome other voices and opinions because together the future is bright. Combined we can stand strong and free.

[Translation]

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Madam Speaker, I would like to first of all thank the hon. member for Winnipeg South for her role up till now as chairperson of the special joint committee on the Constitution and for having expressed so well tonight the aspirations of the people of the West.

We too have consulted the people of the riding of Davenport.

[English]

In the month of July we mailed a booklet with questions to every household, and 162 people took the trouble to reply. At that time, eight months ago, the mood was quite different from that of today. Today the mood in the riding of Davenport is one of intense despair due to the fact that plants have closed and unemployment is high, gasoline stations are scheduled to close, people are running out of unemployment insurance benefits.

• (2040)

The general economic situation is in such a decline that people are even losing faith in the future of Canada. Therefore, for these reasons, Madam Speaker, as you have heard from many other colleagues who have spoken here tonight, the sense of confidence in the future of the country is progressively undermined. For this reason the population at large finds it extremely difficult to understand the purpose of the constitutional exchange, important as it is.

### *The Constitution*

In broad strokes of the brush, those who have replied in substance say that they strongly favour one Canada. They express faith in a strong federal system. They express a belief in bilingualism as a binding force for Canada. They express a dislike for preferential treatment of any province. They express strong commitment to the cultural diversity of Canada. They express strong support for a unifying Constitution, as opposed to one that would parcel out Canada and make it a collection of 10 or 12 provinces or territories, communities or regions. As you can see, Madam Speaker, the perspective from a riding in west Toronto is obviously for strong federalism.

In reply to the question whether a constitutional statement on the nature of Canada should include our attachment to the two official languages, you may be pleased to know that 67 per cent replied yes.

In reply to the question whether a constitutional statement on the nature of Canada should include the diversity of our cultural heritage, again 67 per cent replied yes.

When it came to the difficult question whether a constitutional statement on the nature of Canada should include the distinct character of Quebec society, only 33 per cent said yes.

To the question whether a constitutional statement on the nature of Canada should include the recognition of the role of aboriginal peoples, an astonishing 81 per cent said yes.

Then the question was asked: Do you favour the free circulation of people, goods, and capital within Canada? Here, the highest percentage to any question came through, 93 per cent. Specifically on the elimination of provincial preferential buying policies, that elimination was favoured by 69 per cent. As to the elimination of interprovincial restrictions on trade, 86 per cent said yes. As to the elimination of interprovincial barriers to practising some professions, again it was in the eighties, 81 per cent said yes.

The question then was asked: Do you favour a reformed Senate in which senators would be elected? Here the reply in the affirmative was 85 per cent.

The next question: When legislation is passed in the House of Commons, do you believe that the Senate should have the right to amend it, the right to reject it, or the right to delay it for six months? The majority, 45 per