

*Human Rights*

know. When you look at the Canadian history that you must put over to a 14 or 17 year old boy or girl you do so in the hope that you are achieving some kind of citizenship indoctrination, some belief in the nation, the spirit of it and where it is going. You have a number of dates and acts upon which you hinge your course.

There is always the Quebec act. There is always Durham's report and the act of union. There is always 1848 and responsible government with Lafontaine and Baldwin as the architects. There is always confederation and Sir John A. Macdonald, Cartier and the British North America Act. You move on from there to the emergence of Canada as a nation, not any longer a colony, and to such matters as the naval bill. You treat with the conscription crisis, and what it means, as well as with such incidents as the Chanok affair in 1922; the Statute of Westminster; the Rowell-Sirois report, and all these sign posts because you are attempting to give to the student an awareness of the Canadian traditions.

I am trying to look at this from the point of view of a schoolteacher. We are going to have in 1960 a bill of rights. In looking at the bill of rights I try to ascertain what message you could take from it to put in a textbook for the students. If anyone has tried to teach history he would discover that the hardest thing to put over is what responsible government is in essence. I have known teachers who have taught that lesson a dozen times a year and who have never been able to get a satisfactory response at the end of that time.

I wanted to turn to another type of history or another class of history that we teach that is much easier to put over and that is either United States or British history. United States history is taught in grades 9 and 10 in Ontario and is associated with Canadian history, as is British history. I think it has been regrettable that British history has not been separated. You get a mixing of the three. I find that the students apparently respond much more quickly and understandably to the signposts, the major points in United States and British history than they do to Canadian history. They can understand the declaration of independence or the Gettysburg address much more quickly than they do to the idea of responsible government or Durham's report. In so far as British history is concerned, you have the role of all the kings and of the great men of British history who tie things together. It is very difficult as a teacher of Canadian history to put forward Canadian heroes and make them stand in any kind of stature against the figures of United States history.

This is why it is always so disappointing to all of us after our students have passed out into the world that they are much more aware of Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson than they are of our own great figures. This is one of the reasons they can tell you about Nelson or even Napoleon; they have some idea even where a person like Gladstone fits, but they cannot give you a response to a Canadian figure. This question of the dullness of our history and of the inability of those of us who teach it to put it over, to make it live with vigour is something that bothers every one of us who has tried to do the job. We can think of all kinds of reasons to excuse ourselves and to excuse the nation itself.

It is with this sense of frustration and dissatisfaction that I have to look at this bill and to see how I, as a teacher, if I were preparing a textbook, could possibly fit this into our social studies or our history texts. I believe we have something that is going to be just as difficult to sell—I use the word "sell" not in the modern merchandising sense—as responsible government because there is no ringing preamble to this bill of rights. There is nothing of literary merit about it. It seems to be largely an exercise in legality and the sadness, as I pointed out at the start, is that we are continuing the typical Canadian difficulty.

Somehow, we seem to be the heirs of two traditions, the United States and Britain. We seem to be strangled by both. We get so much from both and yet when it comes to something like this we are back in the old position of compromise of our sovereignty and allegiances, a complete mix-up of jurisdictions in the country and a lack of unanimity. Despite all the nice things, the kind things that have been said in this house about human freedoms, it is a sad thing that we cannot have a short, pithy document, something that we could give to the young people of the nation.

Of course, you can look to other things that we have not obtained for our young people. We have not a national flag and some say we have not a national anthem. However, we are now going to be able to say that in 1960 we have a bill of rights which was introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker), that it has been of great interest to him for a long time, that some amount of dissatisfaction was felt with regard to the bill but that the government felt that this was the best that could be done at the present time.

May I underline why this situation is so sad. The British tradition that we have, with the respect the British people have for the individual, is something that is different from