certain fundamental principles and values. One of the major objections and disappointments I had over the finalization of the constitutional process was the lack of a provision to entrench property rights.

If we do not entrench property rights this country will be much the poorer for it, and we will see the poverty and the non-production situation that we see in the socialistic nations of the world like the Soviet Union and others under their collectivization and non-ownership of property.

On September 21, 1982, the British Columbia Legislature unanimously passed a resolution calling for entrenchment of property rights. I must add that was unanimously passed. The New Democratic Party in 1972 would not support this concept but changed its mind. That Party wants to win an election.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): We are going to win.

Mr. Wenman: But the thing that is so dishonest is that the NDP then brings in a motion, and here is the old NDP socialist philosophy of non-ownership, which refers to the home and farm only. The limitations are coming.

Because British Columbia put this initiative forward, because I am a Member of Parliament for British Columbia and because I support this concept so strongly, on January 21, 1983, I placed the following motion on the Order Paper for consideration.

Motion No. 83;

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider holding a constitutional conference to discuss amending the Constitution Act, 1982 so that Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms reads as follows:

"7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty, security of the person and the ownership and enjoyment of private property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice."

Most recently, on April 18, 1983, the local council of the community I represent in Langley, B.C. passed a resolution that property rights be included in the Constitution. Broad support for this concept exists at all three levels of Government in an expression of grass roots support across the Canadian spectrum from the municipal to the provincial to the federal.

I urge municipal councils across Canada to listen to this debate this week, and each municipal council close to the people know they want this property right, and should call for resolutions of support from municipal Governments in order to get those property rights entrenched, as Langley, B.C. has done, and as I hope Surrey, B.C. and other councils across B.C. and Canada will do.

Property has been a fundamental concept in the tradition of parliamentary democracy and western democratic philosophy from the ancient Greeks to the classical Liberals such as John Locke, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. John Locke was the first to make the case for property of unlimited amount as a natural right of the individual, with precedence over the rights of Government. In fact, Locke's primary justification for the existene of limited Government was its role in protecting unlimited property for the individual.

I would much prefer this resolution to read "as a natural right". I would much prefer that it were in keeping with the definition I have just read, because the natural right is a broader protection than the fundamental right. I would prefer that it were there, but I am accepting the compromise because I am desperate to have this entrenched while we have the agreement, and again, as I have mentioned earlier, because of the threat to property that an election of an NDP Government in British Columbia would pose as early as next week.

Mr. Fisher: They might win.

Mr. Wenman: Hopefully in a democracy, any time there is an election and Parties are running, one Party wins. Otherwise, there would be no point in having an election and you would not have a democracy. That opportunity is certainly there.

Mr. Siddon: The Liberals do not understand that.

Mr. Wenman: One of the factors as to whether or not the NDP will win in B.C. will be how the NDP responds to the Government and the Opposition Motion in the Parliament of Canada. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) can substantially influence how B.C. will react and what will happen in British Columbia. If this debate on this amendment is any indication, he has done the damage we anticipated would come from the basic position that says no property rights for Canadians in this natural sense I have just described.

Property as a natural right in the Lockean sense therefore means unlimited ownership. This amendment is limited ownership, considerably limited ownership. Is this the definition of natural justice that the Liberal Government is putting forward? I wonder whether someone from the Government or the Minister intends to define what they mean by the limits to the enjoyment of property? Is the Minister going to assure us that he is going to use the word "ownership"? I would like to have seen in the motion the word "ownership", just to have an indication of that little extra piece of guarantee. I would prefer to have seen in the motion another word, the word "private". I would like to see both the words "private" and "ownership" included. I feel the motion is incomplete without them, but again in a parliamentary sense I must accept some measure of compromise.

The American Constitution is based to a large extent on Lockean principles; Article V (5) states that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." Article XIV also guarantees property through due process of law. The American Constitution has a double guarantee.

The Rousseauan concept of property also derives from natural right but states that property of a limited amount that a man could work on by himself was a sacred right while unlimited property was unjustified because it deprived most men of any property at all and therefore contradicted natural right.

Jean Jacques Rousseau's philosophy was a prime force behind the French Constitution and the declaration of the