

Human Rights

Mr. Grafftey: Does the hon. member agree with the doctrine put forward by the leader of his party and by the hon. member for Laurier, that we should proceed by way of amendment to our constitution which, today, would call for the intervention of the Westminster parliament in London, or does he believe that only the Canadian government is able to pass sound legislation to protect human rights?

Mr. Deschatelets: The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi is now again stating the erroneous theory advanced this morning by the Minister of Justice.

I shall reply to that question by saying that the theory set forth this morning by the Minister of Justice is childish, that he can try to explain it to the people of Canada, but that he would never dare expound it before the Canadian bar.

Mr. Grafftey: A supplementary question—

Mr. Martineau: Would the hon. member allow me a question? In his statement, the hon. member quoted as an example of violation of individual rights a Quebec election act. Does the hon. member remember the famous Dillon bill, passed by the Liberal administration, cancelling election recounts in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Pigeon: It was the symbol of dictatorship.

Mr. Martineau: In 1931?

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker, the question put to me by the hon. member in no way affects the principle—

Mr. Martineau: Answer the question.

Mr. Deschatelets: I will answer your question. We Liberals have always advocated freedom for all individuals.

Mr. Martel: Especially in Newfoundland.

Mr. Pigeon: The Dillon bill—

Mr. Deschatelets: And I am prepared to condemn any illegal legislation passed even by a Liberal administration. We are people who base our convictions on principles that remain unchanged.

Mr. Pigeon: The famous Dillon bill.

(Text):

Mr. E. L. Morris (Halifax): Hon. members who were able to be in the chamber immediately before the distinguished speech of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Jung) were treated to a most astonishing per-

[Mr. Deschatelets.]

formance by the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier). To uphold such a thesis will require that I endeavour, without notes, to expose the essence of his arguments and endeavour to discredit them. So I start off by flying a flag of truce before the loyal opposition and inviting their attention during the few minutes in which I shall be speaking, though I shall not be surprised if some hot-blooded Liberal evangelist gets up and hauls down the flag.

What was the essence of the hon. gentleman's case? It was to endeavour to inculcate in the minds of the members of this house the very worst sentiments in Canadian federalism, the things which would divide us and keep us apart; to introduce race, colour and sectionalism into a debate which is intended to solidify the unity of the Canadian people.

I am one of the class of '57. I have been here three years. The hon. member for Laurier is accustomed to say, if any one of us who has been here only three years rises in his place to make a cogent intervention, "Oh, you have only been here for three years", as though longevity were the only source of honest feeling about Canada. This happened only this morning. One of the hon. members from Quebec made an interjection and the hon. member for Laurier wheeled on him and said in effect "You are too young to know anything about Canada; you have only been here a few years".

Mr. Pickersgill: He said no such thing.

Mr. Morris: I am sorry, but I cannot hear the inaudible imperfections of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Pickersgill: I just said the hon. member for Laurier said no such thing.

M. Morris: Well, unless the *Hansard* record is changed we shall all be able to see the truth. That has happened before.

Beyond the front steps of this building the question of the bill of rights is not essentially a legalistic or even a constitutional argument, and I speak from three small years of wisdom with regard to this. That is our duty here in this chamber, to preserve the legalities and the constitutionality of the legislation. Listen to the heartbeat of the people in the galleries or beyond the front steps of this building, and hon. members will learn that this is a spiritual issue; and the thing which annoys the Liberal opposition is that they did not themselves introduce a measure of this kind.