

right to resort to the courts. What are hon. members opposite doing to them? They are taking away the right to negotiate. What kind of leverage will they have? What kind of hammer or clout will they have if we pass this the way it is now without identifying what rights they have?

Since when have the provinces not taken their responsibility? The answer the minister gave me was that no rights will be removed and that the federal government will not assume any responsibility. Since when have the provinces neglected their responsibility? Let us look at some reserves and make a comparison with respect to the way the provinces have looked after them. The houses are bigger. Sewer and water services are in place. Many facilities are better because they are looked after by the provinces. Now we take away that clout and say they can negotiate with the Prime Minister later. They do not trust the Prime Minister because there was no prior consultation. They are told they can resort to the courts. Who will fund them? They have no money. Furthermore, they do not trust our courts. Why should the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan trust the courts when it was the courts that came down with the decision to hang Louis Riel?

It is the same organization which springs from those days which is now talking, but hon. members on the Liberal and NDP benches should not tell anybody, including the Metis and Indians, that they are giving them anything. Up until now they had the right to negotiate and to resort to the courts. The right to negotiate is to be taken away, and these people do not trust the courts. That is the position they are being put into.

Just so there will be no doubt in the minds of hon. members opposite, I have here a telegram from the president of the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan. Because of the time element I will read just part of it, as follows:

The purpose of this telegram is to express our complete opposition to the so-called "native rights" package to be included in the proposed new Constitution . . . We believed our appearance before this committee was the first step in the consultative process with provincial and territorial native leaders which would lead to the establishment of a solid native charter of rights in the new Constitution.

Such has not been the case . . . the Native Council of Canada does not represent us.

That is exactly what I was trying to tell hon. members. I mentioned the membership.

I will read only parts of this telegram because it is so long. I am sure anyone who wants to see this telegram can have copies.

Your package is not one with which we are in agreement. Furthermore, the process is wrong . . . Mr. Prime Minister, will you not heed the cries of the Canadian people, including our membership, and admit that the process leading to a new Constitution is wrong?

That was from Jim Sinclair, the president of the association to which I have been referring.

My time is rapidly running out, but there are a few other things on which I would like to comment; for example, the right to own property. I happen to come from a stock or race of people who were peasants, in many cases, in central Europe

The Constitution

and who had no right to property and could not possibly hold property. They came to this country. We did not have a charter of rights. We did not have to set out the right to own property in a charter. These people came to this country because they knew they could own property here. It was a tradition. They had heard about Canada. Canada was free; you could own land.

However, governments became very big and strong. The most vocal people asking for a charter of rights are the socialists. They are vocal because they are the first people to encroach on our rights. Over the years they imposed their demands on the public. They moved their greedy hands into every aspect of our society. They have moved in and infringed on our rights, with the help of the Liberals in Ottawa. We have come to the point where people have submitted to the fact that their rights have been lost. This has happened without our thinking about process.

What we should be doing is enshrining in a charter permission for government to move only in certain areas. Instead, the process has been reversed and the government is saying, "We are going to give you some rights." Who gave the government those rights in the first instance? When people came to this country, they settled in small communities and selected leaders. They selected people to serve on councils. Those councils were given rights. Those rights were given to the councils by people. One by one they expanded and became governments, but the rights were in the hands of the people. Because of the octopus of big government we have now reached the point where people are losing their rights and they need to have a charter of rights.

What we do not realize is that over a period of time governments have become important and the people have no importance. To reassure the people we now have to resort to giving them a charter of rights. If we did not have the type of government we have had, we would not have to resort to this type of approach. The people always have rights. Governments have never had any rights except those rights the people have given them. Now the government says it is giving the people a charter of rights and freedoms. The government says that in the charter it is recognizing the rights of Indians, women, natives and so forth. This government recognizes only one thing; let that be clear. It is making itself supreme. That is wrong. Only a country like Russia can get away with a bluff like that. Article 72 of the Russian constitution reads as follows:

Each Union Republic shall retain the right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R.

The republics named are the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic, Estonia, Latvia and so forth.

A dinner is being put on by the Estonians and Latvians. Do hon. members think they would not like to secede? What good is that type of constitution? This government says it is giving the Canadian people rights, but the Canadian people have always had rights. Because of encroachments by governments