

*Human Rights*

● (1630)

[English]

No way. That is Bill C-147, Clause 28. I just had a few minutes to listen to the debate in the Senate, but that is not at all what we were sent here. It is not to allow Parliament to vote supplementary credit. It is to allow the institute to derive its money from aid programs. It allows the institute to go outside of Parliament to bring in new moneys.

Let me give a concrete example, Mr. Speaker. If the institute were to initiate a study and what have you in a country that is not the object of assistance, it will allow the institute to bring money out to study what may happen, let us say, in Poland. If it wants to give some support to the question of studying Solidarity, this would not be possible under the objectives of the Bill. It will now be acceptable according to Clause 28.

I like to co-operate. I look at people on the other side who are looking at me in anger. I regret that people will be angry at me for raising this, but in matters pertaining to foreign affairs, national defence and international development, I have always had a great deal of interest. I have not always been lucky enough to get the nomination I should have had to be the critic or otherwise—this will be a long story some day—so when these matters are put before the House, it is the only occasion I have to put my views.

This is a good Bill as amended. Therefore, I thank the Senate for having at least at the last minute, on the last day maybe, scrutinized the Bill. The Senators would have come up with a totally different Bill if they had had more time, a Bill that would have made sense, one that people would understand and that people all across Canada would be happy to have and be part of. We have to agree that the Bill as presented was not that perfect if at the last minute the Government has accepted a major amendment to Clause 28. I have not read the Bill today, but I have listened to what happened a few minutes ago in the Senate.

I would have liked the Minister in charge to explain to me word by word what it means. It means a hell of a lot more than what people envisaged. I was listening to an Hon. Senator who is not a Liberal. I was there to listen to a remarkable man, Senator Ottenheimer from Waterford—Trinity. He is a Conservative from Newfoundland. He is an extraordinary, bright, articulate Senator. I was listening attentively to what he was saying just an hour ago in the other Chamber, so I cannot be accused of quoting Liberals. He asked about the definition we may have in this country on democracy.

I look at my colleagues. At least some are interested. I thank the Hon. Member for Kootenay East—Revelstoke (Mr. Graham) for his interest. I look at what they mean by pluralistic. It is the ultimate in arrogance to believe that our kind of system is the kind that applies to every country in the world. There are countries just emerging from the British Empire, the French Empire, the German Empire, et cetera.

These are ex-colonies that are now new democracies in their own way. I will stand here and defend their right to be different from mine. True democracy does not necessarily mean for all the world to follow our kind of system and government. In some countries it may be a one-Party system where they have a lot of elections. Or it may be our kind. Of course we may by having a real democracy in Canada show by example, but we must not be arrogant and tell others that what we do they do. That was the meaning of some of the wording we found in the Bill.

I regret that at the very last minute I have to get up and speak like this without a file. My staff are like the majority of Members, they think there is an election on and everybody has left. It is too bad that we do not have a Minister here, perhaps the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) or the Minister for External Relations (Mrs. Landry). I know everyone is busy preparing for an election. We hear it may not come but it is our duty to know what the hell we are talking about. I am trying to follow the French translation to make sure I do not speak too quickly. If I could only leave you with a thought, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

... a comment. I do not understand how, in our Western style democracies, we who want to give the rest of the world an example, I do not understand why every time, whether it be the Liberals, the Conservatives, the New Democrats in the Western provinces where they have held power, the PQ or Mr. Bourassa's Government in Quebec, there is always this tendency, when Members are exhausted, at the end of their rope, and something may be about to happen, tremendously important bills like the one on child care are brought forward. Child care is important, Mr. Speaker. The Senate is still discussing it and I am told that the Senate is probably going to sit tomorrow, as an exception, to study child care because they might in the last minute accept a Bill on which there is not even agreement. But frankly, for future generations of parliamentarians, for the generations to come of those who believe in the British Parliamentary system . . .

[English]

I say that in French for those who believe in our parliamentary system which originates from the British parliamentary system. I am not afraid to say that in French. The British parliamentary system is one of the best systems *sous lequel nous opérons*—under which we operate, I think it is in English—in the world. We must take care of the good merchandise as they say. I do not understand why government always comes at the last minute with things and is unable to arrange an agenda, but I leave that to those in the future to decide. I would have liked to have this Bill because I have received so many representations from non-governmental organizations and human rights groups. They would have liked to have appeared as witnesses. It is sad that they were not able to. It is sad that these people could not come forward and make suggestions because now we are stuck with this Bill for years to come. To have to wait three years or five years to find