

and to a fair trial, the right to free expression and to free association. We should proclaim the equality of all before the law. We should also declare that everyone has an equal right of access to the public service in our country. Finally, we should add that all human rights and fundamental freedoms belong to every person without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religious belief or political opinion.

I need not say to my fellow senators that with those sentiments I heartily agree. If those principles were enunciated and made clear and effective in our law, there would not be very much left to my resolution. To my honourable friend from De Salaberry I should like to say that far be it from me to oppose his desire, that we make it clear in such a declaration that the equality of right of our mankind is consequent upon the fact that we are all children of the same Creator.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I am sorry that the honourable senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid) is not here. He said that we could "dispense with any suspicion that any member of this house is opposed to the principles or ideals outlined in the resolution". I would assure him that I entertain not the slightest particle of such a suspicion as to any honourable senator, including himself; but I will say to him that when he essays to be "realistic and practical", as distinguished from "academic and idealistic", he is altogether out of character. Idealism has been a characteristic of all the great leaders of the hardy race from which he is so proud to have sprung—from William Wallace and Robert Bruce to Bobbie Burns and the senator himself from New Westminster. I would far rather have heard the honourable gentleman make a speech on the ideals rather than on the dull technicalities of the resolution.

The honourable senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid) says I am premature in striking this blow for human rights and freedom. Well, I do not know that very much is to be gained by discussing this point. I will admit it. But the same thing could be said of the great advocates of freedom in the past; they were all premature. Moses was certainly premature when he presented, in stone, the fundamentals of social morality. Of course he was away ahead of his times. The barons at Runnymede were certainly premature in the action which they took. So were the Pilgrim Fathers, and the drafters of the Declaration of Independence. Yes, and I might almost say that the Fathers of our own Confederation also were premature. So if I am premature in moving this resolution at this time, I am in very good company. At all events, my proposals are neither "too little nor too late".

In my judgment the honourable senator from New Westminster over-emphasized his objections, for he opened his speech with an acceptance, which I have in part quoted, of the principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and he closed with an acknowledgment that I had carried out the wish of the United Nations in publicizing the text of the resolution and calling attention to it. For that last remark particularly, and for a good deal else besides, I thank him.

I am sorry that the honourable senator from Charlotte (Hon. Mr. Doone) is not present at the moment, for although I have already expressed my thanks to him I should like to thank him again for the forceful and inspiring address which he gave to us on this subject, an address reminiscent of the classic oratory of Burke and Sheridan in the House of Commons of England. The Senate, in my judgment, is richer for the ideals which the honourable member from Charlotte expressed.

The honourable gentleman from Kingston (Hon. Mr. Davies) attempted to analyse the resolution in detail. Honourable senators will observe that I have carefully avoided any detailed or particular analysis of the statements in the resolution. I thought it would be premature to do that, and I confined my remarks to the general principles involved, leaving to a committee of our own house, or to some other body, the task of examining the phraseology to see that it carries out what we have in mind. First let us have thoroughly in mind what we desire and where we are going. I of course sympathize with the honourable gentleman's aversion to censorship, for I have always felt irked and annoyed to think that any policeman can tell me what I may read. At the same time, I suppose that at times censorship is necessary.

In reply to the very earnest words spoken in this chamber last night by the honourable senator from Kennebec (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt), let me say that true freedom is never licence and that the liberty of each individual is necessarily limited by the equal freedom of everyone else. Men in modern times live in communities, and no one has the right to live and act as if he was in the world alone. He who desires to preserve his own freedom, perhaps to widen it, should respect the rights of others. It seems to be a law of nature that men best defend and widen their own freedoms by struggling for the rights, safety and welfare of others. Freedom is not divisible; it is a communal matter. I emphasize the assertion, that men best defend their own rights by struggling for the freedom of others, as we are now doing in this house.

The resolution has attracted wide notice and provoked much comment outside the