

*Hate Propaganda*

I said in my speech that if this bill does anything, to the best of my legal understanding and I believe to the best of the legal understanding of the best constitutional lawyers—I do not include myself in this category but I have discussed it with them—the bill will likely work, as I will point out, against minorities in Canada.

Just on that point, surely if we are to build a nation and a just society, the great thing that Canada is 100 years after confederation, we must forget whether we are Polish, or German, or Scottish, or English, or Irish—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Or Welsh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Yes, or Welsh—or whether our religion is Jewish, Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Hindu or any of the others, and simply be people who work together, who understand the cultural environment that we have here, and build a nation as Canadians.

I am tired of hearing about people who cry and wring their hands about minorities. I realize there has been abuse in the past, particularly in the case of certain names. Here, I mention the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). He is a good friend of mine, and I refer to his name, Mazankowski, only in the metaphorical sense because I know I am not allowed to refer to him in the House by his name. He said that people had referred to his name.

I have also experienced that sort of abuse in this environment. I come from British stock, three generations Canadian. The first thing my grandfather and father saw when they arrived in the city of Saskatoon (1903)—and I use this as an analogy only—was a notice that said: "No Englishmen need apply". I do not know whether it was because they were so urbanized that they could not ruralize, though I think that was my grandfather's and my father's problem; they could never get into the rural atmosphere.

My father wanted to escape the pavement, but when he got into the rural atmosphere he did not know whether to plant posts or plant potatoes when using a post auger. These people were not wanted because they were no use to the development of Canada in the materialistic approach used in the pioneering days, and as a result you saw these signs saying that no Englishmen need apply. I suppose that disturbed him. When I was sent to a rural school dressed in brown velvet with shining buttons, these ruralites really took me on, and I do not blame them. It did me no

harm. As Shakespeare said, "Sweet are the uses of adversity which, ugly and venomous like a toad, wears yet a precious jewel in his head". Only in adversity do we build character, so let us not get all drippy over the subject of minorities because we have all suffered together in building a great nation—Canada. Bringing the culture of all of us together with understanding and education is the only way, to my mind, that we will continue to build a great nation. We should not legislate division.

With that introduction I should now like to refer to one of the problems in the debate at this stage of third reading. I am one of those who, when the rule changes went through the House of Commons, questioned two particular rule changes. I used all the ability at my command, both in my party and in the House of Commons, to stop them. Firstly, I still maintain that the power of this institution lies in the power it held over the purse strings. When the government took the power over the purse strings away from this House and assigned it to a committee, we lost power.

Secondly, I do not say that every bill should be studied in the committee of the whole clause by clause, but our system of studying bills has been completely reformed. I think most people here—and I am getting a little unkind in this regard—are followers, not leaders. Some people are so frightened of the medium of communication that if they read a bad editorial they run and hide. If somebody says that Parliament must be reformed, they say: "That is what you have to do because votes cannot be won." We must lead. When we cease to lead, the medium of communication has to step in and lead for us. Because this bill goes to the very root of human and civil rights of Canadians, it should have come before the House of Commons and been studied clause by clause.

What is the weakness of the committee system? We have a fairly good legal affairs committee, though I will have something to say about how unprejudiced and prejudiced it was at certain times. The number of Conservatives who attended the committee was limited, as was the number of Liberals, New Democrats and Creditistes. Perhaps there was only one Creditiste on the committee, and he would have to go back to his caucus and, with all his wisdom, tell them what was in the bill. Most members of parties attached to the House of Commons are so busy that you would be lucky to have an important piece of legislation like this discussed at one or even