

Supply

Mr. Broadbent: In any case, on my part it is a very serious proposal. It could be done very quickly. I now simply await the responses of both the Minister of Justice and the Conservative Party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. The Chair has a small difficulty: in the ordinary course of events, and pursuant to the Standing Orders, following the speech by some particular Hon. Member, in this case the Minister of Justice, a period of ten minutes is accorded for questions, answers and comments. I recognized the Leader of the New Democratic Party and did so, not so much because I accepted the idea that he was raising a point of order but, rather, because it was my view that the ten-minute period could be extended slightly to permit him to enter that period.

If there is to be a point of order, I would naturally ask the Hon. Member for Oshawa if he would state his point of order. If, on the other hand, he wants to continue the debate on behalf of his Party, then the Chair is quite obviously prepared to recognize him for the purpose of speaking on the subject matter of debate, and that would permit him to move any motion he desired. However, the Chair has noticed that some negotiations or discussions seem to be taking place outside the Chamber and some are taking place inside. I can only be responsible for those taking place inside.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance), on a point of order.

Mr. Lachance: I just want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that it is not customary to discuss on the floor of the House aspects of the Standing Orders concerning the business of the House. I would like to suggest that perhaps representatives of the parties could, in the two or three hours remaining today, find some way to meet and discuss these propositions so that a proposal could be made before the House, which could then dispose of it, rather than having such discussions or negotiations on the floor of the House.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I think that the Hon. Member for Rosemont has made his point. Perhaps even better than—very well, perhaps better than the Chair has.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fennell: Be careful.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I wanted to avoid going too much into the problem.

Mr. Epp: We never do that in committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): If there are discussions taking place outside the Chamber, the Chair can in no way have any influence on that. If Hon. Members want to have discussions within the Chamber, that is perfectly acceptable. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Oshawa, but at this point

I think I must recognize him in debate unless, of course, he wishes to state his point of order.

● (1430)

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a well known tradition in the House that Members can rise on a point of order at any time to address a possible new concern that might obtain unanimous support.

I made a suggestion and I noticed that the Conservative House Leader seemed to be showing some interest in the proposition, if I understand the situation correctly. The Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) is nodding his head and showing some interest in the proposition as well.

With unanimous consent, I wonder if we could either continue the debate or suspend it for five minutes. We in this Party are open to either option. We could continue the debate and have another speaker rise to speak. We would be very happy to do that, and I see there is agreement on that process. We can continue with the debate and discuss this possibility in the meantime.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I believe I should seek the views of the House. Would there be agreement to the Chair suspending debate for ten minutes, or shall I recognize another Hon. Member?

Some Hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Then we are in the process of debate. The Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy).

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, in the course of my speech I will introduce the motion that the Leader of our Party wishes to present. It is a proposal that would allow for a proper method of dealing with the constitutional amendment, and it is one that does not keep the public in the dark. It is a proposal that allows for those who have deep concerns about the process of constitutional amendments in this country to appear before a committee of the House and explain why they are in favour of or against the inclusion of a property rights amendment in the Constitution, or perhaps to suggest a wording for the amendment which would make the entrenchment of the right of property in the Constitution more acceptable. At the same time it would allow Government and other individuals protection from any abuse of property rights.

The NDP has always supported the right of Canadians to own their own homes and family farms. Home ownership and family farms are central features of the Canadian way of life. They are privileges enjoyed by Members of this caucus who own their own homes and their own farms. They enjoy that ownership of property. Throughout the history of the CCF and the NDP we have continually supported legislation which secured these rights against threats of high interest rates, the ruthlessness of banks and the uncertainty of the market.