

*Supply*

to amend Clause 7 of the Constitution of Canada containing exactly the same wording as the motion before us today?

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of the Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon), it should be very obvious from the amendment which the Speaker has in front of him at the present time that we have presented a motion on property rights supporting the entrenchment of property rights, but also allowing the public of Canada a chance to participate. My Leader has already expressed in the House our view that we are not asking for many drawn-out hearings, thus preventing the debate from ending or preventing the matter from coming to a vote. We are saying that we must ensure, when we pass this first constitutional amendment, that it is practical and can be used, not something rushed through the House after a short four-hour debate.

• (1450)

**Mr. Siddon:** Mr. Speaker, I have a short supplementary question for the Hon. Member for Churchill. The Hon. Member has conceded that he does not agree with the support given by the former NDP Premier of the Province of British Columbia. Does the Hon. Member support the inclusion in the Constitution of Canada of the phrase, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property," etc.? The reason I ask the question is that I think it is important for the House to determine whether the New Democratic Party still stands by the concerns its Leader expressed in February 1980 when he said that this amendment would deny Governments in Canada the right to expropriate and nationalize certain industries which they wish to nationalize for particular political purposes.

I think it is important for the New Democratic Party to come clean and tell the people of Canada why it is opposing this very important amendment. Once again I ask the Hon. Member for Churchill whether he personally supports the inclusion of the phrase, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property," in the Constitution of Canada?

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta seems to be unaware of the fact that most of the rights about which he is talking are already in the Constitution. The only one lacking is the enjoyment of property. We have said very clearly that we are in favour of having a property rights clause in the Constitution. We have said that. I have certainly pointed out in the debate that we wanted to ensure we have wording which is acceptable to Canadians and to the majority of the House of Commons and does not prevent Governments from acting.

I for one would be concerned that we ensure provincial Governments can still set aside land for recreational use. I hope that whatever we pass does not prevent that. Also I hope that whatever we pass does not give banks more rights than workers. I would also want to ensure—and I hope all Hon. Members of the House would want it ensured—that the individual maintains and retains as many rights or at least

equal rights to those possessed by men of property. That is our concern.

I do not know how often we have to say it for the sake of some Hon. Members, but we have said that we favour a clause on property rights in the Constitution. That is fairly clear.

If they are asking us whether we are willing to say yes to their proposal and yes to a short four-hour debate after which the first constitutional amendment would be passed, I have to express concern and say that I may favour the motion but I will certainly not allow it to pass after only four hours of debate and absolutely no public participation.

**Mr. Fisher:** Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy). I have noted that our good friends across the way keep insisting upon the phrase, "The right to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property". Would the Hon. Member care to join me in a commentary on the phrase, "life, liberty, security of the person," as it relates to the petitions of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) who keeps calling on us to hang Clifford Olson?

**Mr. Taylor:** You want him to go on living.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting remark, but I do not believe it belongs in the present debate. This debate is quite simply on whether or not the House of Commons will rush through and rubberstamp its first amendment to the Constitution. We have said—and we will continue to say it until it becomes clear to Members of the Conservative Party and some Members of the Liberal Party—that we do not want to pass a constitutional amendment in that way.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party are trying to play a word game while practising a very different action game. I want to put a question to the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy). Since the time of the Magna Carta, property ownership has been re-enshrined in the Diefenbaker Bill of Rights and has been part of the concept and practices of the country. The concept in their amendment of owning their own homes and farms simply speaks of symptoms. Property rights is a concept far beyond that. Property rights implies the right to have first draw on the fruits of labour. The Communist Manifesto clearly lays out that one can extend to all citizens all privileges and all rights because if the state controls property then all other rights are for naught. What value is freedom of speech when the state owns every place where one can speak? What right is the freedom of assembly when the state owns every place of assembly? Surely the New Democratic Party should come clean and tell us that the reason it does not want property rights is that it wants the control of the state and it is willing to give Canadians homes and farms. Property rights go to the right of first draw on the fruits of labour. NDP Members should know that what they are doing is a socialistic scam on what has been a 700-year tradition in the democratic system of Parliament.