

Furthermore, the bill has been before the Committee of the Whole House where latitude is given to make changes which expand it or contract it within the principle of second reading.

Now we come to third reading and we have the bill in specific terms, and I think it is obvious that third reading is intended as a final protection for Parliament, to give the bill final consideration before it becomes law, and that there is a final opportunity to reject or to refer back to the committee if the House feels that the committee has not done what it should have done.

With that in mind my conception of a proper amendment on third reading is that it should not depart in kind; it should not introduce new principles. Quite frankly, as the honourable Member read his amendment I could see that paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) could be added on to those declared principles in clause 1 of the bill which were declared as having existed and continued to exist in Canada, and enumerated as the right of the individual to life, liberty, etcetera, and the right of the individual to equality before the law, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of the press. These are all matters which could be brought before the court where an individual could claim the right. It does not involve the expenditure of money. It does not involve anything other than protection of those rights by the law of the land.

Now, when I came particularly to the last two paragraphs of the amendment, it seemed to me that there one departs into a new and different area of legislation. I am not sure that it would not involve the expenditure of money if it means what it says, and it would therefore have to be preceded by a resolution. But in any event, I do distinguish in my mind these rights in paragraphs (i) and (j) of the amendment as being different in character and in order from those enumerated in clause 1, particularly a right such as the right of the individual to social security.

If that right means anything at all, it means social security in the commonly accepted sense of the term. It means the right to maintenance by the state under certain circumstances, either because of ill health or unemployment, or whatever it may be. Social security involves not the protection of a right which exists but the granting or the providing of something by the state as of right.

Paragraph (i) goes on "and his entitlement to realize the economic, social and cultural activities indispensable for his dignity", etcetera. Paragraph (j) refers to "just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection." That surely involves the right to work at a fair wage.

If that sort of right is to be asserted in legislation it is not something that arises simply by saying that it exists, and is therefore not of the order which can be protected by access to the courts. It involves I think not the protection of some personal right or right of property which an individual enjoys, but involves a right to add something which he does not already have in the form of economic well-being.

I distinguish those two and therefore feel that this does go beyond the bill as it was originally drawn and as it was debated on second reading and