

Property Rights

because they have that independence, they can make a living for themselves and are not dependent upon government. This is what property rights mean.

In the part of Canada that I represent, which is one of the most highly governed areas anywhere in the world, that lies in the back of the mind of the people who administer us there. They are very reluctant to let Crown land be sold, or even on occasions to let it be leased. They want to keep it in the collectivity, so to speak, instead of allowing individual ownership, knowing full well that once people become property owners they will demand that degree of independence.

Property rights are notoriously absent in the constitutions of Communist countries. That has not prevented people in those countries from still having that inherent desire to own something. I remember on several occasions talking to people in Moscow, and other cities in the Soviet Union. Their greatest pride and joy was their dacha in the countryside. They are not able to actually own it, but they can get some title or lease. They told me that what they liked to do more than anything else in the summer was to go out there and sit in their dacha. But they would really like it to be theirs, and not belong to this great collectivity. So even in countries where they have tried to stamp out property rights, it still keeps surfacing again and again.

Why is it not in our Constitution? It is not there primarily because of the opposition from the NDP. I understand that when we were discussing these matters in 1981 the Liberals

might have been in support of the motion that was put forward by members of the Conservative Party to enshrine property rights in the Constitution. But after what I assume was reflection, they decided to go along with our socialist colleagues.

Of course, if the fundamental element of party philosophy is that the means of production, which is of course largely land and buildings, should be owned by the state and not by the individuals, as if the individuals are not to be trusted to own this, then of course one would not want property rights in the Constitution.

In closing, I notice that British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Ontario have now passed resolutions along the lines suggested by the Hon. Member for Kitchener. Thus, despite the efforts of our Liberal and socialist friends, it looks like eventually we in Canada will also enjoy these fundamental property rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 36(2), the order is dropped to the bottom of the list of the order of precedence on the Order Paper. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

At 3 p.m. the House adjourned.
