

spouse's allowance will be devoted over a two-year period to senior citizens. They conveniently ignore that fact.

They have also mentioned the 15,000 jobs that will be cut in the Public Service. I want to say clearly to my colleague that those 15,000 employees are not going to be laid off. It will be done through attrition only.

Mr. Speaker, here is my question: Does the Honourable member feel that the reduction of interest rates, due to the fact that government deficit has been brought under control, will benefit to citizens who will buy goods, appliances, to those who will have to renegotiate their mortgage loans, or to—

● (1700)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member has nine minutes left of the period for questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) will be able to reflect on that question and answer it next time. We are now going into Private Members' Business.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS— MOTIONS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent for the House to proceed to Item No. 67?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Constitutional Act, 1982, should be amended in order to include property rights and, that the Governor General issue a Proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada to amend section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights so that it reads as follows:

"7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice."

and this House urges that the Legislative Assemblies of all provinces and the Senate pass similar resolutions.

He said: I count it both a privilege and a responsibility to introduce and defend this motion before the House of Commons today. It is a measure of its importance that this motion has already been introduced on two previous occasions during the brief tenure of this parliamentary session. It was intro-

Constitution Act, 1982

duced first by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) on December 6, 1984, and then by the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) on February 1, 1985.

This motion follows the considerable discussion which took place on the subject matter—the inclusion of property rights in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms—throughout the 1981 constitutional debate and during the subsequent debate on the motion for a constitutional amendment introduced by the present Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) on April 29, 1983. The recent parliamentary history of this subject indicates at least two things. First, it indicates that this is a complex and somewhat contentious issue which cuts to the very heart of philosophical and political ideology. Therefore, of necessity, I shall outline the premise, intent and substance of this motion. Second, it indicates that, for all its complexity and contentiousness, this is an issue which will not simply go away. Consequently, it is the responsibility of all Members of the House to address and render a final decision on this important matter. It is my hope that this motion may be referred to the appropriate committee, thereby leading to a conclusive debate and the enshrinement of the enjoyment of property as a fundamental right protected by our Constitution.

The basic premise of this motion is that adding the words "the enjoyment of property" to Section 7 of the Charter of Rights will give a natural and undeniable corollary to the words "life, liberty and security of the person", rights already secured in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. To omit and deny the right to private property is to diminish and indeed render meaningless the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Life, liberty and security of person cannot be viewed as abstract principles existing in a vacuum. In order to have any meaning, they must have tangible correlates. To a certain extent, the framers of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms recognized this fact. They knew very well that such fundamental principles as liberty and security of the person must be given concrete expression. Therefore, the Charter specifies in Section 2 freedom of conscience and religion; freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication; freedom of peaceful assembly; and freedom of association. Various other concrete freedoms are enumerated throughout the Charter, including the freedoms to vote in an election, to choose where to live within Canada, to pursue the gaining of a livelihood, and so on.

The Charter is also specific with respect to its principle of security of the person. For example, it stipulates that everyone has the right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure, arbitrary detention or imprisonment and improper procedures upon arrest or detention. All of the above is right and proper. However, the Charter does not pursue its own inherent logic far enough to include the enjoyment of the fruits of that liberty in private property.

Let me elaborate. A life is actively lived out in time and space by men and women who require certain properties such