

*The Constitution*

that my interests were being fully represented and properly expressed, as were the wishes of the majority of the people of Prince Edward-Hastings. That was not so when one of the Liberal members of the committee, Mr. Lapierre, stated that within two years we would be rid of the monarchy.

● (2130)

I believe in the rights we enjoy through the parliamentary system, the rights we enjoy through the common law, and the rights which are protected by the Crown. I believe it is important in our Constitution that we guarantee the role and the status of the monarchy, and I for one want to retain that heritage rather than have the republican system being forced upon us.

I was well represented on the committee, and so were the people of Prince Edward-Hastings, when the Hon. Perrin Beatty introduced, with great clarity and detail, an amendment having to do with the right to own property. The family farm, the family business and the family home represent some of the most fundamental elements of Canadian society. Yet, anyone who has ever dreamed of owning his home, farm or business will be disturbed by the fact that, while the Diefenbaker Bill of Rights included the right to enjoy property, the charter of rights proposed by this government in the Constitution is mute on the subject. I believe the right to own property is a fundamental right, a right which should be enjoyed by all Canadians, yet the government opposite with its majority voted down that right.

It is interesting to note that the particular amendment was supported by many organizations from all across Canada, including the Canadian Organization of Small Businesses, the Canadian Bar Association and many others, yet it was turned down. It is indeed frightening that a socialist Prime Minister, supported as he is by a supposedly socialist opposition, purposely wants to omit this right from his charter of rights.

Once again I was well represented on the committee, as were the beliefs of the people of Prince Edward-Hastings when the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) introduced an amendment having to do with the position of the family—and that is the belief of the people of Prince Edward-Hastings—affirming that the Canadian nation is founded upon principles, and acknowledging the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free individuals and free institutions; affirming also that those individuals and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values under the rule of law.

While perhaps not as many people think about it as often, I know my interests and, therefore, the interests of the people of Prince Edward-Hastings, were being well served when the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) spoke on the clause dealing with the freedom of information. We all know the extent of government in Canada, the growth of the bureaucracy and the threat it imposes on the individual in terms of an individual's right to know what the government knows about him. With the computerization of information

and the use of the SIN by the government and by institutions, wrong information and, in some cases, information no longer relevant, can plague a person for the rest of his or her life. Surely under these circumstances they should be entitled to know exactly what is in the file, and they should have that right under freedom of information.

To deal with a more technical aspect of the process, Senator Duff Roblin, on February 2, spoke eloquently on why the so-called Vancouver formula should be used rather than that proposed by the government. Senator Roblin is no stranger to Prince Edward-Hastings, having spoken there on a number of occasions, as indeed have all the other members of that committee.

Basically, what Mr. Roblin was proposing was that the provinces be consulted and given a far more equal chance to create the changes necessary in our Constitution rather than having the federal government do it alone.

So without being present at the committee hearings and without taking an active part in the committee itself, I am content that my interests and those of the people whom I represent were well cared for by that committee. It is indeed unfortunate that each of those rights I have just quoted were turned down by the Liberal majority.

It is my considered opinion that over the almost 114 years of our confederation, we have had very little to be concerned about by way of freedom. It seems to me we are more endangered now by the implementation of the Prime Minister's charter of rights than we ever were before. Not to have these various rights written down has never bothered me. I knew they were there. To write down only some of them indicates that the rest are not available to me, and that concerns me very much.

Why is it so necessary to force a charter of rights through the British parliament at Westminster? Why must we rely on another Parliament to do what we should be doing here at home? Before I answer that, I want to make a point which is particularly important to the people in my area.

The Prime Minister repeatedly and emphatically refers to Great Britain, the United Kingdom, as a foreign country. As one whose parents were born in that foreign country, I resent that allegation very deeply. I resent it more for the way in which it is said than the words themselves. I am confident the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) does not consider Greece a foreign country. I am confident the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) does not think of Germany as a foreign country, at least not in that context. These are the countries in which their parents were born. These are friendly nations, along with many others, which are the birthplaces of many Canadians. This does not make them foreign in the context the Prime Minister uses those words.

As a matter of fact, my father who came to this country in 1913 and voted in every election from the time he was old enough, now, of course, requires a citizenship in order to vote. He, like many others who thought of themselves as British