

Canadian Statement to the Third Committee
on Monday, November 29, 1965.
Professor R. St. John Macdonald



Mr. Chairman,

The Canadian delegation had an opportunity to outline a few of its views on implementation during the general debate last week. At that time we expressed the opinion that reporting, and conciliation on a state-to-state basis, desirable and helpful as they are, did not (in our opinion) go far enough, and that a petitions procedure was a necessary complement to these older and more traditional methods of implementation. We took the view that for a variety of reasons it was in the long range interest of all who would promote human rights and, in the case before us, reduce racial discrimination, to accept the idea that eventually the individual ^{ought} right to have access to competent international authorities who can pass on the adequacy of national standards in the human rights area. We pointed out that this concept of freeing the individual from the strait-jacket of the national state was part and parcel of the great ideas which were popularized by the English, French and Russian revolutions, and which have become an accepted part of the thinking of twentieth century man. We urged our colleagues to be experimental, Mr. Chairman, and we pointed out that in related matters, such as the Declaration Against Colonialism, 1960, radical implementation ^{measures} ~~moves~~, once agreed upon, not only dissipated the skepticism and suspicion which surrounded them but confounded the pessimists by proving to be