

*Adjournment Debate*

that did not even bother to apply to appear before the committee because they knew there would not be time and, therefore, they would be rejected.

But, the group was right, the major focus of the Constitution is on the individual. It sounds very democratic to focus all of one's attention on the individual, but if one looks very carefully at that document, the focus is on the individual as an existential entity, as though he is a little island separate from every other individual in the country. The fact is that seventeenth century writer John Donne was absolutely right, that no man is an island. We are all part of the main; we are all joined to each other. If one tries to separate or divorce one individual from every other individual in society, to focus only on the rights of that individual and to emphasize his rights as an individual only, one ends up with chaos; one ends up with anarchy. If every individual in the country demands and demonstrates on behalf of his individual rights, he will override the rights of the group; it ends up in chaos.

The constitutional proposal does nothing, not even in Section 2. I point out to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development (Mr. Irwin) that not even Clause 2, which supposedly gives rights to an individual to belong to associations, does anything.

● (2215)

It just will not work. It will not wash. If we are going to have this kind of a constitution, there must be an entrenchment of the rights of the groups in our society. Ironically, the proposal allows individuals to vote, but gives no rights to the association.

The most important institution we need to protect in our society is the family. Take a look around the world. Any totalitarian society you look at makes certain that it can disintegrate the family wherever possible. They take children away from the family as soon as possible so there are no family loyalties of any great depth; and thus the disintegration of that society begins. This proposal rejects entrenching the rights of the family.

My colleague, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) introduced a resolution in committee to include the rights of the family in the Constitution. It was rejected by the Liberal-NDP alliance. Second, all other institutions in society, whether they be churches, independent or public schools or hospitals, are support-systems to the family. It is through the family, and through these group institutions, that we pass on to our children and our children's children those values which we think are important. If there is no provision in these proposals to entrench the rights of these institutions, then we are in deep trouble. Other provinces have done so. If the minister will read the telegram from British Columbia, he will find that the British Columbia bill of rights has provision. I would read the Saskatchewan bill of rights:

12. (2) Nothing in subsection (1) (freedom of education without discrimination) prevents a school, college, university or other institution or place of learning that enrolls persons of a particular sex, creed or religion exclusively, or that is conducted by a religious order or society, from continuing its policy with respect to such enrolment.

Why is there so much hurry? We have time. We do not have to get it done by the end of March. We should take enough time to entrench everything in this Constitution that ought to be entrenched. Thank you.

**Mr. Ron Irwin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development):** Mr. Speaker, my one regret tonight is that I do not have an hour. I heard the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) telling us all the things we should entrench in this Constitution; yet the position of his party is to support nothing. They support patriation; at least, in October, they had the courage to say, "Patriation with amending formula". As of last week, they did not really have the courage to support an amending formula.

**Mr. Friesen:** Be honest, Irwin.

**Mr. Irwin:** I will be honest. Go to the speech of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). He says we have a package; the first is a Canadian package and the second is the patriation package. The patriation package is the amending formula. The Canadian package is everything else.

Freedom of association does not talk about the collective rights of the union. When you vote against freedom of association you are taking away their rights—aboriginal rights, collective rights. Talk to the natives, when you vote against their rights. Talk about the English and French, minority language rights in the schools. Explain to the Francophones of New Brunswick, Ontario, the Anglophones of Quebec, that you will vote against their collective rights.

I say that the hon. member does not have the courage to vote collective rights or individual rights. I think we should put this to rest.

I have heard the name of God mentioned today, all day, by the hon. member. The fact is that it was a Liberal who put the name of God in the National Anthem; it was a Liberal who put the name of God in the Diefenbaker Bill of Rights at the parliamentary committee, on the last day, as mentioned by the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). It was God—it was a Liberal who put—

**Mr. Friesen:** A Freudian slip.

**Mr. Irwin:** It was the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who put the name of God in the preamble to the Constitution, and that was turned down by all the other premiers this summer.

You say you are going to support God. Where do you say that, in Section 1? That is part of the Canadian package. So, you are saying, put the name of God in section 1. Make it the subject of the Vancouver formula, and let all the premiers opt in on the name of God. How silly can you get? That is where it is: in Section 1. You say, "We are for the opting in of Section 1. Each premier can decide whether he wants the name of God put in or not, but we will not vote on this matter. We will not vote on this; freedom of religion in Section 15." That is your position. You will not support Section 15 in the Bill of Rights which deals with freedom of religion, because it is part of the