

Supply

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, the House gets treated to a lot of rubbish from time to time, and I suspect that is how we can treat those last remarks. The right of property has to be balanced by the right of individuals. We have heard people speaking in terms of property rights. I read an article in one of last week's editions of the *Winnipeg Free Press* that reported a mortgageholder saying that they have more rights to the assets of a company than the workers working there on the basis of property rights. That is something which scares me and that is something which we are saying must be clarified before we pass a constitutional amendment.

There are other concerns which have to be addressed when we are looking at the Constitution. At the present time there are things in the Canadian Bill of Rights which should be in the Constitution. One such thing is the inclusion of the right to a fair hearing. The provision of that right would protect Canadians as well. There are many protections which could be enshrined in the Constitution.

I wish the Conservatives would get off their rhetoric and actually help us. We are the ones who are trying. We are the ones who are introducing a motion which allows for the public to come and talk to us about their concerns about property rights and express why they would like them in the Constitution, and if we put them in the Constitution, we would like to know what wording would best suit the needs of all Canadians. That is reasonable. I hope the Conservative and Liberal speakers who follow me will support the proposal put forward by our Leader, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), that substitutes the completely unacceptable Conservative motion with something which will allow public participation and allow Canadians to debate for more than four hours the first amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. Bosley: Mr. Speaker, I have what I think even the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) will find a simple question. Why does the Hon. Member's motion create two limitations to the concept of property rights? First, it defines property rights as only home ownership or farm ownership. In other words, it eliminates the right of someone who owns an office building to own it.

● (1500)

Second, why does it not even entrench that limited right but rather say that it wishes to entrench the principle? Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to indicate why he believes that people who work in a building ought to have greater property rights than the people who own it.

Mr. Murphy: With regard to the first suggestion—

An Hon. Member: Where does it say that?

Mr. Malone: The Communist Manifesto says that.

Mr. Murphy: The last word from the Conservative Party suggest it was the Communist Manifesto. I have never read the Communist Manifesto. If he has, I will certainly take his expertise over mine.

Mr. Epp: Did you read the Regina Manifesto?

Mr. Murphy: In the amendment we have proposed, we talk about the principle of the right of Canadians to own their own homes and farms. Let us not restrict this to one definition. It is the whole subject of property rights. We have said that the whole subject must be sent to a committee of this House where all Parties will be participating and where Canadians can come forward and speak about their concerns. That is simple. I find it so obvious and necessary to the democratic system that I really wonder why these so-called defenders of property are afraid of the Canadian public. Why are they afraid to let the Canadian public come forward and talk about property rights? What is their fear?

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, when I was initially asked to speak in this debate I wondered how I was going to fill up my 20 minutes. After the last two speakers, my problem has been solved. This amendment, and I am sure your judgment will be sound, Mr. Speaker, has to be the greatest pile of garbage I have seen in my life. First, the Hon. Member wants to protect people's homes and farms, but he does not protect the people's sofas, stoves, refrigerators, cars or anything else. On the farms, the state can own the cattle, tractors, trucks and whatever else is around. This is absolute garbage. They are terrified that democracy is going to come back to Canada. They are terrified that we may get some democracy in this country. They like socialism as it has been practised over the last 13 years. They want to put this into another committee. It has been in committee for two and one-half years. We are respecting the will of the people. It is the lack of rights, about which the people of this country are concerned.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) protesteth too much. He was terribly worried about his bedmates during the Constitution debate, that he could not cosy them along, so he will use any excuse to disrupt this debate. He was waiting for the NDP reply. I am sorry the Minister of Justice was not here to hear the NDP reply. I would like to have heard him ask some questions about it.

We placed this motion before this House of Commons because it is the will of the Canadian public to get this measure adopted, and adopted in one day as agreed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Leader of our Party. We worded it in such away as to respect the will of the people of Canada.

The one question I am asked day after day is when is there going to be an election. This would have been our opportunity to have an election, but that is not as important as getting the Charter changed to include property rights.

Mr. Evans: What have you been smoking over there, Scott?

Mr. Fennell: My friend for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) is as close to the socialist left of the Liberal Party as you can get, so I can appreciate his comment. We have always had a yelling match because he does not like some of my views about individual freedoms and independent business. That is the other point I want to make.