

The Constitution

All people of any religion or non-religion should stop voting for any politician who condones legal abortions no matter what the party.

We do not vote for known crooks no matter how brilliant they may be.

We do not vote for those who condone legalizing violence against unborn life, no matter how many times they appear at church.

Still quoting the article, Mr. Speaker, it continues:

If you want to know which MPs accept legalized abortion, watch for the coming vote on the charter.

And as a final note of confirmation of the government's intentions, I will quote this piece of evidence from the same periodical:

Upon receipt of the text of Mr. Chrétien's amendments to the charter on his speech of January 12, the following note was found among the section by section explanations: Section 15.1 "'everyone' is replaced by 'every individual' to make it clear that this right would apply only to natural persons"—

Thus the intention of the government is perfectly clear. It does not intend to do anything for foetuses, unless it does a complete change of heart.

I fervently hope, and many Canadians hope as well, this will indeed be the case, Mr. Speaker, that the government will have a complete change of heart and reverse its attitude regarding unborn human beings and guarantee their rights as well in the proposed Constitution.

Before concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to dwell for a moment on one other aspect of the proposed charter of human rights, or, to be more correct, on one aspect that is omitted from the charter of human rights, and that is, the ownership of property. The ownership of property is conspicuous by its absence from the charter.

This omission from the charter, Mr. Speaker, has resulted in a considerable amount of anguish, disbelief and anxiety among all segments of our population across our land. In many cases it took considerable hardship and hard work to assemble the required capital to buy property in the first place, and now people find that their ownership can be jeopardized and taken away from them in any number of ways, contrary to their own wishes and desires.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, not enshrining property rights in the proposed Constitution is a glaring omission, and the government must admit it is a serious error of judgment on their part to omit this very important right from the proposed charter of human rights. Such an omission, Mr. Speaker, will have serious consequences for a very large section of our population. Such an omission, Mr. Speaker, has to be rectified, and property rights must be included in the Constitution. To ignore this, Mr. Speaker, could be considered a direct affront and disservice to all the people of Canada.

If the government really believes in the democratic principle, it will know that it was elected to serve the people and not the other way around. That would be the undemocratic way, with the people subservient to the government. That is something which Canadians abhor and disdain and they will not tolerate it for long.

Mr. Mike Landers (Saint John): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this historical debate and to read into the record a letter I received from a constituent

whose view of Canada is totally compatible with my personal view. The letter, dated May 16, 1980, reads as follows:

Dear Mike,

You may remember that we met several years ago before an election when you were touring the Ridgewood veterans wing of the Saint John regional hospital.

I am writing to you as my member of Parliament from Saint John, New Brunswick, in hopes that you will do everything in your power to expedite negotiations between the federal government, the other provinces and the province of Quebec as soon after the referendum is over as is possible. I am assuming that Mr. Claude Ryan's forces are going to be successful. And I feel very strongly as does my family that we not only want Quebec to stay in confederation, but we want them to know that they are as equal as any other Canadian in every way, shape and form. We want them to know that as a founding people of this nation that their culture and aspirations can be met and protected in our confederation of Canada. We want them to know that it enhances our culture and will make for a stronger Canada if their hopes and aspirations can be met within our union. There is no need for any bad feeling among anglophones and francophones. This country has plenty of room for us all to flourish in peace and prosperity.

I had the good fortune to study medicine at the University of Ottawa in the late 40s and early 50s—then to practice among the Acadians in Shediac, New Brunswick for five years. They are wonderful people and it is my hope that they will be able to develop in every way in a united Canada.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Ryan so he will know the feelings of the Creamer family of Saint John, New Brunswick. While we do not intend to sell our own English heritage short we do not intend to sit idly by and watch our French Canadian cousins lose all the things they hold dear.

Yours very truly,
(Dr.) Roy Creamer

What I would like to ask Dr. Creamer to do is keep writing.

Mr. Speaker, not all of my constituents are as fair and broadminded as Dr. Creamer. The worst comment—and when I say worst, I mean the slimiest comment I have heard since the introduction of the resolution on the Constitution in Parliament—was from a constituent who, to protect the narrow-minded and ignorant, shall remain anonymous. His comment was to the effect that anybody supporting the resolution was, "a French Canadian papist". The only reason that I would condescend to even repeat such a dastardly remark is to point out that there are some prominent New Brunswickers whose ancestors would be quite surprised to hear their descendants referred to as "French Canadian papists".

Three New Brunswickers who have given solid support to the resolution on the Constitution come to mind immediately. Imagine the look on the faces of the English protestant ancestors of Premier Richard Hatfield to hear him being referred to in the manner previously described. Imagine the look of astonishment on the faces of Gordon Fairweather's English Anglican ancestors, or the look on the faces of the British Anglican ancestors of the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. McCauley).

● (1520)

Turning to the substance of the resolution, a Canadian charter of rights and freedoms will guarantee that Canadians are entitled to the following rights and freedoms with respect to all matters of federal, provincial and territorial responsibility: fundamental freedoms, which include freedom of conscience and religion; freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of