The committee also dealt with Senate reform. It was divided on it, quite frankly. X Some, like me, wanted to abolish the Senate outright. Others wanted the Triple-E Senate. When asked this morning, they said that to the committee. They came up with a compromise, which would be an elected Senate with reduced powers but on the German model, where the bigger provinces get more seats and the smaller provinces fewer, but the smaller or middle sized provinces like British Columbia have a little more than would be normal so that they could be better represented in the federal government. It seems like a good compromise.

They suggested that the House of Commons be reformed, but that should be done here in the House of Commons. It does not need to go in the Constitution. XXXXX

They dealt with the Supreme Court of Canada, and they had a particular British Columbia worry. The government proposes to freeze the Supreme Court as it is now: three Quebec judges, three judges from Ontario, and three judges from the rest of the country. They said: "Wait a minute, B.C. will soon be one of the most populous parts of the country; people are moving to B.C. We are growing like mad. Let us not enshrine this", they said, "because there may in the future need to be a judge in the Supreme Court specifically from British Columbia". This reflects the dynamic nature of the B.C. way of thinking.

On the Bank of Canada, they said do not constitutionalize a failed economic policy or one political idea of an economic policy. However, we could put in the Constitution the nature of an economic union. We should be able to move goods and services and people throughout the country. That makes sense.

An interesting aspect is on culture. My committee dealt with the CBC. They said: "Yes, you can have provincial control, more provincial powers in broadcasting and so on, but do not destroy a national institution like the CBC; be careful about that".

Under government programs and services, where the constitutional proposals are that the provinces get additional powers like in wildlife conservation, tourism and so on, they had a good point. One of the points they made was that when a boater pulls into a small harbour in British Columbia they see a sign that would say: "Canada". My people want to keep that. They want to keep the symbols and the signs and the powers over all of the Government of Canada.

On property rights, I will read what the group said: "The committee is thoroughly uncomfortable with the inclusion of property rights in the Constitution, because the proposal as it stands is vague and undefined". The idea was seen as pandering to big corporations, business and real estate interests, and again not in the general public interest of Canadians at large. There is a clear sense within the committee that a constitutional provision should apply only to a matter of central national public interest and not to particular interest or special interest. The committee opposes the inclusion of property rights in the Constitution.

• (1900)

Finally, although this is not in the government's proposals, the committee wants us to deal with the social charter. It thinks there are general social benefits that are available to Canadians as a whole and this should be in the Constitution.

Let me say again how proud I am of the submission. Let me table it for the House and for other members to see. Let me conclude by saying we want to see and we should see more people participating in the process. When you get the ordinary Canadian participating and sitting down to talk together you get real constitutional solutions.

This country could be lost. We are in a constitutional crisis, and we have to use all our talent. I am very proud of the moderate, visionary and doable proposals of the group from Port Moody—Coquitlam, and I am pleased to present them to the House.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest): Madam Speaker, tonight I take this opportunity to present to this House and the Canadian people the views of many of the constituents of Calgary Southwest regarding the constitutional proposals. My report is expressed in terms of a consensus that was generated after listening carefully to