

*Human Rights*

So we have heard this morning appeals to the very things which we have barely survived in Canada; separate schools, the teaching of languages in schools, appeals to race, appeals to sectionalism and even an appeal to the black peoples. As one who has one of every four coloured people in Canada among his constituents, may I ask what did the Liberal party do about the rights of those people? I will tell you. Once every four years a two dollar bill and a pint bottle of liquor; those were the rights of the black people.

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Morris:** These are bitter words. The shame is not mine. Outside in the lobby some of my friends on this side of the house tell me not to become emotional. Well, there are things in this country about which one should become emotional. One of them is the subject of fundamental human rights.

At a time in history when the area of freedom is closing in all over the world, we here in the House of Commons of Canada have a chance to say to the world that not only do we have these rights, but we will take our stake and drive it into the ground and declare that we shall always preserve these rights.

Instead of that, what do we hear? We hear an appeal to drive us apart, to separate Quebec from the rest of Canada, to separate the races in Canada, to separate even black people from white people in Canada. I want no part of it. I did not come here three years ago to preside over the break-up of Canada. I say that outside this building, outside in the bountiful land of Canada, this is a matter of the spirit. We have taken a step in this bill of rights which will portray us to the world, if we let it and if we do not divide ourselves, as a nation which means to keep itself free.

If that is the essence of the bill of rights, then let the hon. member for Laurier, who feels so strongly about this bill, be at least consistent and vote against it. When the Prime Minister asked the hon. gentleman how he would vote, his colleague the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate said that was a cheap interjection. Voting is not a cheap interjection. I say to the hon. member for Laurier, if you feel that strongly about the bill, then vote against it. That is what we are here to do, to vote for or against this bill. If his feeling is so strong, then let the hon. member vote against it, and at least rectify through consistency some of the respect which the hon. gentleman lost here today.

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Bonavista-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, I have not very many words for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr.

Morris) who happily is one of those who provides his own antidote as he goes along. But I do think I should remind those hon. members who listen to speeches instead of having them written for them that the hon. member for Laurier did none of the things the hon. gentleman suggested he did. What the hon. member for Laurier did was to suggest that the best kind of bill of rights we could have in this country would be a bill of rights that applied to everybody in Canada, in all jurisdictions in the country.

In saying that the hon. member for Laurier was saying precisely what the Prime Minister said in 1948, as I intend to show a little later on. The hon. member for Laurier also indicated that we realize, as everyone realizes, that it may not be too easy to get the necessary agreement with other jurisdictions, to get what would be the best; and that if we cannot get what would be the best, and if the government will not do what we think would be the second best, that at any rate we will take what little is left.

The hon. member for Halifax put this question to the hon. member for Laurier. "If the hon. gentleman feels so strongly about the bill why does he not vote against it?" I did not hear anything in what the hon. member for Laurier said that suggested he felt very strongly about this bill. I should be very surprised if the hon. member or anyone else did, because it is impossible to feel very strongly about this anaemic bill.

In order to save the Prime Minister asking once again that usual cheap question that he asks when people debate—how are you going to vote?—I hasten to say that of course I am going to vote for the bill, in exactly the spirit in which Oliver Twist took the first bowl of thin gruel and in no other spirit. It is thin gruel, but there is nothing wrong with it. It is a harmless thing. It cannot do us any real injury. The only objection is that it is so very different from the advertisements that in fact it is going to be very disappointing to many of those who thought it was going to mean a great deal more than when it appeared in its first form in 1958 and then in its improved version 20 months later, with improvements that one has almost to use a microscope to find. One wonders why the 20 months' delay.

Since the Minister of Justice treated us to a rather curious rhetorical display earlier today, it seems to me that I should comment upon it. I think the Prime Minister is right in suggesting, as I just heard him do, that the Minister of Justice be sent for. I would rather have the minister hear my remarks.