

*Supply*

because the people in that Province disagreed with the stand he took on this issue.

I would like to quote what the Leader of the New Democratic Party said on January 25, 1981. That was the very key weekend when the Leader of the New Democratic Party induced the Government to flip-flop and to withdraw its support for the property rights amendment that our Party proposed at that time. The Leader of the New Democratic Party said then:

There's no way we can accept the constitutional resolution with that amendment in it.

The NDP fears the amendment could not only prevent provincial legislation restricting foreign owners—

If I might interject, you can get around this.

—but could hinder Governments wishing to nationalize industries as Saskatchewan did with potash and as Quebec is attempting with asbestos.

The Conservative amendment flies in the face of what we're attempting to do in the resource sector . . . tightening up management control—

That is really the nub of it. There is a certain political philosophy in this country that advocates mixed enterprise and distrusts and disregards the fundamental and historical role the private sector has played in creating wealth and opportunity for all Canadians. That other political mind-set is loathe to grant Canadian citizens the right to ownership and enjoyment of property.

This is why the debate today and the vote on Monday is so crucial. We want to find where the Liberal Party and its Leader, who is often put in the same boat with my friends to my left, truly stand on this issue. We want no more game-playing. We want to find out if they will support this very important initiative.

There is an important provincial election under way at the present time in the Province of British Columbia. The Leader of the NDP in British Columbia has now flip-flopped on his policies on mining to the extent that he is trying to cosy up to the mining industries which employ so many B.C. people whom he devastated so miserably between 1972 and 1974 by weaseling away from the property rights amendment question.

His adversaries, the other free enterprise Party which presently governs in the Province of British Columbia, was one of the first provincial Governments to bring forward and pass in its Legislature the same property rights amendment that we are debating here today. Therefore, we must put that in context.

The former NDP Premier of British Columbia is now trying to say he is all for property rights. It will be interesting to see what his colleagues from British Columbia who sit to our left have to say about that. One of his colleagues from Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen) spoke in the House at the time of the constitutional resolution. I do not have the exact quote, but I will paraphrase him. He said it was important that the question of resource ownership be maintained and that property ownership be maintained under Government control because it was the objective of Governments, to which he would subscribe to have the power to acquire property and to nationalize

industry and enterprise if it were deemed to be in the public interest.

The New Democratic Party in a recent policy paper, discussed and approved by that Party's branch in British Columbia, passed resolutions which essentially resolve that the powers of control over the mineral industry be abridged and over-ridden by the creation of a Crown-owned minerals marketing corporation by a provincial agency which would control the export marketing of coal. They would use a last-resort provision if private companies would not comply with their desire to stockpile or subsidize, that in such cases the Government, as a last resort, should have the power to recapture for the Crown the mineral rights where such a company refuses or ignores offers of such help.

The point I want to make is that that type of threat and intimidation against the private sector and the statist socialist philosophy that it reflects represent a genuine danger to Canadians. We have seen examples of it in the attitude and practices of the federal Government through the National Energy Program and its use of expropriation powers. We saw it in British Columbia under a previous New Democratic Party Government.

We want to find out between today and Monday where the New Democratic Party stands on this important fundamental issue. They cannot say they want to wait for the court of public opinion and hold public hearings. Their caucus came to a conclusion of that sort on Wednesday. We want to know where they stand on this issue. We know where the public stands; 95 per cent of the Canadian people agree with this Party on this motion. They want to see it reinstated in the Constitution of Canada so that we can get on with the important economic matters before us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Questions, answers, comments.

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I refrained from rising after the address of the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) because I wanted to give the Members of the New Democratic Party the opportunity to put their position squarely on the record. I thought we needed it because the state of play with respect to the offer which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made last week is that the Official Opposition has agreed to a one-day debate, culminating in a vote on this very important question, and the New Democratic Party has not yet given us a reply as to its position on this. We have been waiting for their reply to try to determine how to manage the business of the House effectively.

I am pleased to enter this debate to endorse the idea of an amendment to the Constitution which would provide better protection to the property rights of Canadians. I regret, and it is rather tragic, that the Official Opposition has put this proposed amendment to the Constitution in such a form that it is impossible for Members on this side of the House to support it. They have put it in the form of a motion of non-confidence. Obviously it is not possible for this side to support it. The Hon.