

Supply

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): As I indicated earlier, at this point, prior to the ten-minute period for questions and answers relating to the speech of the Hon. Member for Ontario (Mr. Fennell), the Chair will rule on the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy).

It is my intention to rule against the admissibility of that amendment. In fairness, therefore, if any Hon. Member wishes to give advice to the Chair in support of the admissibility of the amendment, I will hear that. I do not think there is much point in speaking in support of the Chair's finding that the amendment is not admissible. However, I do not see any Member standing so I shall proceed.

There is a minor difficulty with the amendment in that it was not seconded. I shall rectify that oversight by indicating that the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) has seconded the amendment.

I would refer Hon. Members to the amendment itself. I find that the amendment is self-contradictory as between the first and second paragraphs. That in itself would be sufficient to dispose of it, but I want to go further and cover other aspects of the subject.

I would refer Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 435.(1) which reads as follows:

It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee.

Citation 437.(2) says:

An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice.

It is in respect of the second Citation that I would refer Hon. Members to the ruling given by the Deputy Speaker on May 13, 1977 at page 794 of the House of Commons *Journals*. I want to quote a brief paragraph which is applicable to the situation:

The amendment seeks to widen the scope of the debate by asking the House, not simply to accept or reject the proposition contained in the main motion—

In this case the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). It continues:

—but to consider whether the Berger Report ought to be studied by a committee of this House. That was not part of the main motion. To my mind this is a new proposition.

That is the essence of what I find inadmissible in terms of the amendment of the Hon. Member for Churchill. It is not logically cohesive to the main motion, nor is it philosophically so. Accordingly, I have to find that it is not procedurally acceptable.

Mr. LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Hon. Member a very simple question. Although I agree with some of the sentiments he attributed to me, does he recognize that in some cases expropriation remains a tool preferred by those who are to be expropriated? Second, it is still a legitimate activity, accepted and put into legislation by this Parliament. Does the Hon. Member recognize that I did not really express a judgment on the Pickering and Mirabel differences? I would have to look at the file on those historical events in more depth if I were to make such a judgment.

Mr. Fennell: Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to be able to answer questions from the Minister. He is extremely kind.

I was indicating the differences between Mirabel and Pickering and the pressure the Pickering people exerted compared to the lack of pressure by the Mirabel people.

I agree that expropriation must take place but it must be fair. It is a very difficult measure, and one I know the Minister said he would only use as a last necessity. The fact that there was too much land expropriated in one area at one time, is too bad. It fragmented the fabric of society. That is the kind of thing I was getting at. I do not deny that it must be used, but it must be used very carefully. I think the Minister appreciates that.

I have known some people whose land was expropriated who went to Florida afterwards, and others who are still farming, so there is a difference in different parts of the country. The economic values may be different and pressure groups can make the difference.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Hon. Member for Ontario gave a very good description of what happens when lands are taken. He said, and I quote, "People get heartsick; families break up sometimes; it is not just taking away a home but a way of life."

The reason I recall his words to him is that while it may be fine to go back to Runnymede to determine property rights in terms of common law, this is Canada and the original property was held not by dukes, earls and kings—it did not reside in the Crown but in an original people who in many cases watched that land taken away. They have become heartsick; they have had family breakups and they have lost more than just a home in seeing their way of life abolished.

Since the Hon. Member proposes a quick amendment to the Constitution on property rights, I should like to know how it will affect almost half the territory of this country which has never been ceded to the people of Canada or given in treaty by the original inhabitants of this land. Could we take a few months to find out what they think of our concept of property rights? Since this involves half the territory of the country, is it not important enough to spend more than four or five hours on it?

Mr. Fennell: Mr. Speaker, I should like the Hon. Member to come to my riding and see the Pickering Airport property, see the different homes and barns that have fallen down. I should like to introduce him to some of the families that have split up as a result of this so that he might understand the psychological damage. It has removed the fabric of a farming community. I know the Hon. Member can appreciate that. It removed that way of life for a part of my riding. That is sad. It is beautiful agricultural land.

The original land in Ontario was Crown land. I think within all of Canada the land was either Crown land or that vast part the CPR got. I am never too sympathetic toward the CPR for that reason.