

I now want to come to another situation. May I refer to the second report of the Standing Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments. Like other bills the government brings in, Bill C-25 spells out a lot of provisions, but much of what is going to be done will be done by order in council. What does the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons say about this? It says:

The Committee desires that, in principle, all subordinate law and rules made by the Crown and by those put in authority under the Crown, or by any other delegate or sub-delegate of Parliament, should be subject to Parliamentary supervision, unless specifically excluded.

In other words, regulations and the rules implemented by order in council are turned out by the government like an assembly line. In every bill the government is enlarging the right to legislate outside of parliament. Legislation should be debated in parliament, scrutinized, and voted upon. I see the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) shaking his head, but I know he has been flying around with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and has been getting into bad habits.

• (2110)

The report goes on to read:

Any exceptions from such supervision should be made explicitly and be justified on such compelling grounds . . .

All subordinate laws and rules should, unless again there are compelling reasons to the contrary, be registered centrally and published.

My point is that I hope that when the bill gets to committee those provisions that are to be set down by regulation can be written into the bill.

In the matter of human rights, it seems to me that education is the best way to persuade and to ensure that humanity and equality flourish throughout the land. I am not being critical of the government at the moment, but let me say that I was rather shocked to find that the very first Canadians, the Indians, were excluded from the provisions of the bill because their rights and privileges come under the Indian Act. Having at one time represented the old constituency of Bow River in which the Blackfoot and Morley reservations are located, I know that the Indians are skeptical because some of the treaties and rights are spelled out in the Indian Act, and therefore they are reluctant to see the few rights they have appear even in a bill called the human rights bill.

Leo Tolstoy said the following, and I think he put it very succinctly:

It is very easy to take a child away from a prostitute, or from a beggar. It is very easy, when one has money, to have him washed, cleaned and dressed in good clothes, fed up, and even taught various sciences; but for us who do not earn our own bread, it is not only difficult to teach him to earn his bread, it is impossible; because by our example, and even by those material improvements of his life which cost us nothing, we teach the opposite.

In other words, you can legislate this type of bill, but as long as there are economic differences in Canada—and there are great economic differences today because of the high rate of unemployment which exists in the maritimes, in Quebec and in other parts of Canada—you cannot legislate against economic

Canadian Human Rights

discrimination. No legislation will help, unless we achieve economic equality in Canada.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: I always appreciate when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre speaks on pensions in the House—and I mean this sincerely—because of the inequality which exists between pensions paid to males and females. This bill will not correct this situation unless there is other legislation to ensure that the intent and purpose of this bill are carried out.

I should like to make one comment about the equality of the sexes. We have heard a lot about that. It is easy to say and believe, but it will not occur overnight because of preconceived ideas.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: My hon. friend laughs. I do not know why. Let me give an example. I saw this in my own city. One female is hired as a telephone repairer. She is one woman among 100 men, but that does not guarantee equality. It means more than that. Such an example is merely hanging drapes over an untidy and unsightly window. My hon. friend laughs again. I am sure the ladies do not laugh. This is in the bill. We are not talking about the kind of sex the hon. member is talking about. I know that he is talking about. All I am saying is that there will be no equality between males and females by legislation if it only means that you hang out the drapes over an untidy or unclean window, and you hire one or two females and give them equal pay. That means nothing. It is merely an apology, merely an excuse for the bill.

I want to say again that the setting up of a tribunal or a commission to enforce the terms and sanctions of the bill creates a firm bureaucratic body with absolute power which could destroy freedom if a wrongful decision is made regarding race, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, sex, marital status, physical handicap, or conviction for an offence in respect of which pardon has been granted. There should be included in the bill the right of appeal, and I say that right must be granted from a decision in any superior court in any province. An independent review is a must, because if someone lays a complaint and if, for one reason or another, the tribunal says that discrimination has been exercised, under the terms of the bill the man is liable to have his business closed, and to many other actions.

It is the unalienable right of every Canadian to have the right to appeal the decision of any administrative body which will accept evidence. Having said that, let me say that I think that is the most important contribution I can make to this debate.

An hon. Member: What was all the rest of it?

Mr. Woolliams: You would not understand it, and I feel sorry for you.

Let me end on this note, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this bill, to the wiretapping legislation, and to other acts. I should