

*Human Rights*

excuse for not spelling out clearly our rights and privileges as Canadian citizens? And if we, as the majority, accept our rights and privileges without question, is that any justification for denying to the minority a clear proclamation of their rights?

Because we constitute the majority, Mr. Speaker, we have a double responsibility to ensure that the minority is protected. We, the majority, should be so secure in our knowledge of what constitute our rights and freedoms that we can afford to expose our beliefs to the most searching scrutiny and examination. And if, in the course of that scrutiny and examination, our beliefs are found wanting, we should be grateful that we live under a system of government and a way of life that will still allow us to make amends. And if we find legal difficulties ahead of us, is it not to our credit that we are prepared to grapple with those constitutional difficulties? Mankind may forget why Magna Carta was signed by a reluctant king, but mankind will always remember Magna Carta. So will it be with this bill of rights. Flowery and noble sounding words do not themselves provide safeguards; it is the intent behind the words that counts. Is there any more noble sounding phrase than that found in the United States declaration of independence, where it says in part:

We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But do these words prevent racial discrimination in the United States, Mr. Speaker? Do these words by themselves guarantee rights and freedoms? In spite of its inherent weaknesses, does anyone suggest that the declaration of independence be repealed?

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member has more and he cannot conclude shortly, I am afraid I must interrupt him, since it is one o'clock.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. Jung:** Mr. Speaker, prior to the adjournment for lunch I had pointed out to hon. members that in spite of the inherent weaknesses of the American declaration of independence, that noble and magnificent document, no one has yet suggested that the declaration of independence should be repealed. This proposed bill of rights will be

[Mr. Jung.]

welcomed, certainly by those of my race, as a noble document. It is to the credit of this party that we have a leader who has the courage to introduce this legislation knowing full well the debate and criticism which it must bring.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, our actions will speak more clearly than any words. At a time when in other countries, and I think of countries within the commonwealth, measures are being taken which appear to further restrict the rights of minorities, this country is showing the way by declaring in clear language what constitute basic human fundamental rights and freedoms. This fact should be remembered by those in this country who try to give the impression that certain minority groups are being unfairly and needlessly prosecuted.

We have a Prime Minister who believes in equality for all. That is why, apart from my own position in the house, we have in the other place a representative of that great race who claim to be the original Canadians. Winston Churchill, in paying tribute to those who fought in North Africa during those dark days of world war II, said that forever after it would be enough for one of them to say, "I marched with the eighth army". Because the bill of rights has been introduced at this session, Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of paraphrasing that right hon. gentleman and saying that I am proud to be a member of the 24th parliament of Canada.

(Translation):

**Mr. J. P. Deschatelets (Maisonneuve-Rosemont):** Mr. Speaker, in his remarkable speech, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) stated that the official opposition was in favour of the principle of Bill C-79, but on the other hand, he submitted several important amendments that should be made to this bill.

First of all, he suggested that an elaborate study of this complex matter of human rights be made by a committee formed of all public bodies and other organizations which have already asked to be heard, anxious as they are to express their views on the subject.

Incidentally, I am surprised at the way this matter is being handled by a government which likes to boast of having developed a committee system of members of this house.

That same government might, right at the start of the session, have referred to a committee for consideration at least two of the major issues we have been dealing with during this session—that is, the Canadian bill of rights and the unemployment situation.