

Supply

[English]

Mr. Wenman: What a foolish point of order. I said in my speech, if the Hon. Member will listen—and I see I have his attention now—that one of the first steps within the first few weeks—

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): You said the first one.

Mr. Wenman: It was certainly the first one that caught the attention of the public in British Columbia. I know why he is sensitive though, because along with many other British Columbians I began a movement and the whole Province took fire. Busloads of people went to the legislature and we changed that legislation and then defeated the Government as a result of that legislation. We went to the British Columbia legislature and held conferences with 23 out of 28 MLAs at that time. We asked them if they were in favour of private ownership of property and 18 out of those 23 said outright, no, and the other five hedged somewhat. That occurred when they were fresh from victory and had gained new power.

We now know that private property can be threatened in Canada through our legislatures and our House of Commons by an NDP type of Government, whether it is found in British Columbia, Saskatchewan with threats to its land prior to the last election, or Manitoba.

We have talked today about the need for urgency. There is a new urgency in Canada and particularly in British Columbia because that same premier, with the same hacks that were there that many years ago, are now challenging the Government in an election on May 5.

Mr. Fisher: Are you saying they are going to win?

Mr. Wenman: I do not know if they will win or lose but I do not want to take a chance for the people of British Columbia or Canada. It is a perfect example of how much at risk and open our Constitution is. It could be threatened as soon as May 5 or May 6. That former Government in British Columbia still holds that basic philosophy and it is rising again. The rest of the political spectrum such as the Liberals and the NDP, are trying to become more conservative. They are trying to rush to our position.

The legislation which was introduced in British Columbia did not only include a person's home for expropriation, it included a person's car, tractor, and all real property. It could be expropriated without compensation under that Bill. We now see how far the NDP has come since 1972. They are now willing to let us own our own homes and farms. They have come a long way.

The Government of British Columbia initiated this legislation because it saw what the NDP would do in British Columbia and Canada and did not want to take that chance. The British Columbia Government was the first to call for this piece of legislation and I support them for that.

I can understand why the New Democratic Members from British Columbia are so concerned now, because they know that this amendment will force a debate on this issue in British

Columbia, require the former premier to take a stand which will unmask their intent, as does this particular disgusting amendment.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): They are talking about health care in British Columbia.

Mr. Wenman: The property rights of all Canadians are at risk at this time. We are in danger, because just before I spoke here, I saw again—

Mr. Murphy: Halleluiah!

Mr. Wenman: You are darn right, halleluiah!

It is about time we protected our basic rights. You are darn right it is. If you do not stand up for property rights, stand up and tell your constituents that. I want them to hear you say that.

An Hon. Member: Speak to the Chair.

Mr. Wenman: Of course I am speaking to the Chair, Mr. Speaker. One of the Liberals asks if I would charge the Chair over property rights. I have once, and if I had to do it again I am sure that I would.

These very basic values must be upheld and enshrined and that is what the fight was about. We can see that the NDP and the Liberals are worried. They are being unmasked; what will they do?

Although this is a Friday afternoon, this issue is one of the most important and basic ones to come before the House of Commons. It is a very serious issue and one about which Canadians are concerned. They want to know where we stand. I hope that Members of the New Democratic Party will stand up and indicate whether they are in favour of private ownership of property.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): You should have run for the Soecreds.

Mr. Wenman: I would like to see if they will in fact state, those who are ideologically as far left as the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), that they support and uphold the right to private ownership of property. I would like to see the Hon. Member stand up in Burnaby and say that he is not in favour of the private ownership and enjoyment of property. I would like to see him do that. If he would do that, he would not be back here and that would please me too. As a human being I would like to see him here, but with his political philosophy that does not support the private ownership of property I would just as soon not have him here.

● (1600)

The constitutional debate of 1981 saw the Liberal-NDP coalition vote against the entrenchment of property rights in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Conservative Party fought ardently for the inclusion of property rights because we recognized that one of the inherent flaws in entrenching a Charter of Rights was the potential exclusion of