

Supply

The present proposal is of the utmost importance and demands the full attention of the House and the country. As a result of using this particular process, the Conservatives are doing a disservice to this debate. They are asking the House and the Canadian people to pass our first amendment to the new Canadian Constitution after a four-hour debate. They are saying to Canadians who are concerned about this issue that they have no right to come before a House of Commons committee to express their concerns. They are denying Canadians the right to petition the House of Commons with regard to their concerns because this motion will already have been dealt with. In the name of property rights they are denying Canadians every other liberty that they should have and do have in the Constitution. They have become the Party of property and not the Party of the people.

The legal definition of property is not that of a clump of land with grass on it. The legal definition of property is much more than that. The Conservatives are making a mockery of justice and truth when they rise in the House and pretend that the ownership of a family farm or house is being threatened without this provision being entrenched in the Constitution.

If we are to protect Canadians, we in the House of Commons must allow them to speak to their Members in the House of Commons and give us their opinions and concerns. Any attempt by the Official Opposition and any attempt by the Government to rush this through the House of Commons without that public participation will not be supported by this Party.

I find the whole procedure that has been used by the Conservative Party somewhat abhorrent. They have introduced a non-confidence motion which, by its nature, requires the Government to vote against it. Its purpose is basically to embarrass the Government. Our Party also has no confidence in the Government. We could take the narrow view that the only reason we would support the motion of the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) is so as to oppose the Government. That would be an option we could follow and it may be a consideration in the final vote.

I am more concerned that, by introducing this motion at this time, the Conservative Party is denying us in the House of Commons the right to deal with this matter again during the remaining part of this session. The rules of the House are quite clear that once it has been discussed and voted upon the first time, it cannot be reintroduced, even with new wording. I suggest that it is a plot against property for the Conservative Party to introduce this motion in this manner. The House is being subjected to political games, perhaps to help the Socreds win an election or lose an election in British Columbia. Certainly the Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon) gave a speech which had nothing to do with property rights but was strictly a paid advertisement for the Socred Party in that Province.

We are concerned about property rights. We want to ensure that if we pass a new constitutional amendment, our first amendment, that it be one of which Canadians are proud and can understand and use. We should not pass a constitutional

amendment in four hours for the political benefit of one group or another in terms of what the immediate political expediency of the issue is. It is a matter that will not only affect us all, but all of our children, our grandchildren and Canadians for generations to come. A four-hour debate on this matter is completely unacceptable.

We are concerned about the contents of this amendment as well. If this amendment is passed as it is, will it prevent us from passing laws prohibiting foreign corporations from owning foreign land? Will it mean that data banks can collect all types of information on individual Canadians and be allowed to sell that information because it is their property? Will it mean that legislation cannot be passed to prevent foreclosures because the mortgage is the property of the bank? Will this prevent provincial legislatures from passing laws to protect the environment, enforce minimum wages or for the proper recreational use of lands? Will it prevent legislatures from reforming family law because it may affect property? Those are all questions that we have and which demand answers when we discuss property rights.

● (1440)

Many groups in our society have expressed concern about the quick passage of this legislation. Many of the speakers earlier somehow implied it was the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan which stopped this from being in the present Constitution of this country. But let me read from the *Alberta Hansard* for April 19, 1983 the words of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Horsman. When talking about the Alberta Government's position he said:

—the debate made clear that the Government of Alberta's position is that the constitutional responsibility for property and civil rights being that of the Provinces, should properly remain there and not be entrenched in the Charter of Rights and thus become subject in any way to the control of the federal Government—

Mr. Siddon: That is their prerogative.

Mr. Murphy: The same Minister for the Alberta Government said, with reference to the last constitutional conference held basically on aboriginal rights, the following:

It is true that the case for inclusion was put forward by the Province of British Columbia at those meetings, but no extensive discussion took place relative to that matter. After a brief survey of the various Provinces, it was clear that there was very little support by other Provinces for inclusion of the subject of property rights in the Charter.

I think the point to be made is this. There are seven Conservative provincial Governments, including the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): It speaks well for the country.

Mr. Murphy: —and there are enough provincial Governments under Conservative control that they can initiate and get the required provincial consent. They can do that. But they are not doing that. The Alberta Government is saying that there is not that desire among the Provinces. Those are Conservative Provinces.