

Supply

property rights within the Constitution of Canada; only some principles of property rights and only some property rights. When I read the motion which only extends to the people of Canada the right of property for a house and a farm, I wonder what happens to the mines of Canada that are owned by individual Canadians. I wonder what happens to the timber reserves, or if they are considered farms owned by individual Canadians. I wonder what happens to business dwellings that are owned by individual Canadians, and on and on. I wonder what happens to the implements and tools that are used to produce goods which are not protected as property of individual Canadians.

Within the context of property rights, there must be a principle that states that property rights are important to the well-being of the democratic process because, Mr. Speaker, if you are without the ability to own your own property, and through that property either derive protection or derive an income, you are without the benefit of an economic independence that creates the opportunity to carry on a democratic Government within Canada.

When we look at the history of the property rights question as proposed, when we go back in time to the amendment that was put forward by the Progressive Conservative Members within the Constitutional Committee and when it was placed there in good faith—Mr. Speaker, are you motioning to me?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I was not motioning to the Hon. Member but perhaps I may. In order to be of some assistance to the House I was about to indicate that I should interrupt the Hon. Member to seek the unanimous consent he would require in order to proceed and to succeed in his goal.

I do not want to read the motion again, but my understanding is that the motion, which I find to be in order, proposes to do away with an earlier House order, in the sense that the normal voting procedures would not be given at 4.45, nor would they be deferred until Monday, but rather there would not be a vote and the motion would be deemed to have been referred to the standing committee. We can dispose of that. We now need unanimous consent in order that the Hon. Member may put his motion. If there is unanimous consent to that effect, then I will read the motion again and see if there is unanimous consent to the terms of the motion.

Accordingly, the Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: On behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate our unanimous consent to the motion.

Mr. Murphy: Our problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not have a copy of what was presented by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). If we may see a copy of it, then you could pose the question again.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you defer putting the motion for two minutes and that you let the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster go on with his speech so

that the New Democratic Member may have a copy of the motion.

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I would just say that we would be prepared to agree, both to the putting of the motion and to the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It has been suggested that copies be distributed. Accordingly, again I would invite the Hon. Member, if he is willing, to continue with his speech and copies will be distributed shortly.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to say I do not have a specific place to start or stop, so these interruptions do not cause me a great deal of difficulty.

As we look historically at the debate on property rights, we see that the proposed introduction of property rights within the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in our new Constitution was proposed within Committee and supported by the Members of the Progressive Conservative Party and that Committee at that time. At the same time, the Minister representing the Government, the present Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), gave his consent to the inclusion of property rights within the Constitution of Canada. Over a short period of time, I think a weekend, there was a change of mind and property rights were traded off for support in other areas of the constitutional issue.

At that time, I felt that without the inclusion of property rights, the other rights that were entrenched within the Constitution of Canada in the Constitution Act of 1982 were not as meaningful as they could have been. Since that time, during debate in this House, we have heard some Members say that the Progressive Conservative Party is again speaking of property rights again. I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the constituents of Kindersley-Lloydminster, and indeed I am sure Members' constituents all across this great land, have not stopped wishing since the Constitution was ascended to in 1982 that property rights would be included in the Constitution of Canada.

The reason that some Members of the NDP do not wish to have constitutional rights to property entrenched in the Constitution, I suppose, goes back to the old Regina Manifesto and the doctrine it put forth. At that time, it may have been a cause of concern to the people of Saskatchewan and Regina, but that was some 50 years ago. I think there has been considerable change since that time.

Mr. Speaker, I see that you have something in your hand. I would hope that I could carry on later.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I trust that by this time, as per the request of one of the Hon. Members, that all Hon. Members have received copies of the proposed motion. Is there a point of order? Is the Hon. Member for Churchill rising on a point of order.

Mr. Murphy: No, Mr. Speaker, but with reference to your previous request for unanimous consent, in discussion with other parties we have indicated that our caucus would meet on Monday to discuss this motion and determine at that time