

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has observed that there has been a certain latitude on both sides of the House in this debate. The hon. member who has the floor has indicated that he has taken note of the matter.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I recognize and respect the Chair. I might say that I made my remarks with tongue in cheek.

It will take a long time to overcome the hostility of the provincial governments which was brought about by the constitutional and energy policies. It will take a long time to recapture the trust of western Canada. The National Energy Program is supposed to be for Canadianization, and that is something all of us desire. However, it is nothing short of confiscation draped in the robes of a nationalization known as Petro-Can which really stands for the Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau ruining our Canada. Our symbols of nationhood—the flag, the anthem and the Constitution—should unite us. Instead, we are divided as never before. Trust has dissipated and vanished into the air because of the irresponsible and suicidal actions of this government. In another ideology this type of government would be called a dictatorship. The Liberal Party of Canada has fallen on very dark days.

● (2120)

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the excesses referred to in Standing Order 35 are quite clear here, and I ask that the hon. member be brought to order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have been listening to this point, and the Chair is paying careful attention to the remarks being made.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Liberal Party of Canada has fallen on dark days. The once great party of Laurier, King and St. Laurent has been reduced to a mouthpiece for a retreaded socialist, the last of the so-called—but misnamed, in my opinion—wise men. The Liberal Party has been taken over physically as well as ideologically. That is unfortunate. The sheep are content to bleat away as they follow the wolf, to abandon their principles and desert their party's beliefs and tenets. As once stated very aptly by the late Sir Winston Churchill, "They are sheep in sheep's clothing".

If we let this government have its way we will lose the important rights we now have, the rights which distinguish a democracy from a dictatorship. The most basic of rights is the individual's guarantee of the enjoyment of property without fear of confiscation by the state.

In a radio broadcast on September 1, 1944, Pope Pius XII stated, and I quote:

Private property is a natural fruit of labour, a product of intense activity of man, acquired through his energetic determination to ensure and develop with his own strength his own existence and that of his family, and to create for himself and for his own an existence of just freedom, not only economic, but also political, cultural and religious.

The Virginia bill of rights, the parent of all American bills of rights, in June, 1776, stated, and I quote:

The Constitution

That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity, namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

Our right to property was first asserted in the Magna Carta and has steadily been reasserted in the courts and in statute law. It was reasserted in John Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights and in the United Nations charter of human rights.

Another right we will lose is individual freedom from being imprisoned for mere political opposition. This is not the Soviet Union or China; this is Canada, yet under a section of this proposed Constitution the War Measures Act is incorporated in the new Constitution. Under it, if a government wishes, one can be sent to prison for mere political agitation. The government does not have to wait for one to act or to make an actual treasonable move. If the government even "apprehends" an insurrection, the government can move.

"Apprehension" is defined in the dictionary as a state of mind or a thought or feeling as opposed to reality. "Apprehension" can be committed by placard carriers, people who voice strong political opinions—such as myself—and even strikers. If you end up in the slammer a victim of an apprehended insurrection, do not expect due process of law or a speedy trial. Habeas corpus, our guarantee of a speedy trial, is gone, and it was gone once before under the War Measures Act. It is replaced now in this proposed Constitution by a new law which allows the government to decide what is a "reasonable time" to bring a person to trial.

The government is even permitted to hold off elections if two-thirds of Parliament agrees with the "apprehension" that there is or could be an insurrection. I am alarmed at this assault on the rights of the individual and at this harsh approach to our most fundamental of rights.

The *Barrie Banner*, a local newspaper in my constituency, is not well known as a Tory newspaper or for its all-out support for the Member of Parliament for Simcoe South. An editorial in that newspaper on February 18 states: "Package won't do". It goes on at great length to tell why the police chiefs of the country feel that way. The editorial reads in part as follows:

It seems increasingly evident that the government's constitutional package does not represent the will of the people, although patriation in itself is supported by all of us who think it's time we wrestled out of the outdated relationship we have with Britain.

We all agree with that. It also says that the police association, and I quote:

—is concerned that the legislation will be "so protective of civil rights that crime flourishes, while law enforcement is repeatedly emasculated."

The article ends as follows:

We will never know how important our involvement proves to be, but the next generation surely will.

In reality this so-called charter of rights is doing for our rights what Jack the Ripper did for door to door selling.

Over the years the present Liberal government has attempted to reduce the role of the monarchy and also to substitute, in terms of the status of the Queen, the Governor General as our