

The question may be asked: If this is done for part of the community why is it not done for all? Is there any difference between a man who works for the federal government or the railroad or the insurance company and the general public? If the principle is sound why does it not apply to the great mass of the people? This is a great and serious problem, honourable senators, and I hope that my honourable friends will give some thought to it. It is most important, and should not be brushed aside.

Honourable senators, I have other matters upon which I should like to speak but I shall confine myself to a brief remark in regard to one specific point arising out of the remarks made today by the leader opposite. One of the clauses of the United Nations charter contains a principle to which we in common with the rest of the fifty-one nations subscribe, and which I personally should like to see realized. It is this:

To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

One of the important debates at the United Nations conference was the debate on the racial treatment of Indians in South Africa. I have great sympathy for them. Their difficulties are not over. There are some three million whites in South Africa, and approximately eight million coloured people. Honourable senators, there has been a bitter discussion on this subject. Some people considered that the United States, Great Britain and ourselves took a too legalistic point of view, and said that the problem should be turned over to the International Court of Justice to be dealt with. Mind you, it is on a par with any legislation we may pass in this country that removes a vote from a man because of his colour. That is the principle of it.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: May I ask a question? Was the Canadian delegation asked any embarrassing questions with regard to the treatment of Indians in this country?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I am glad the honourable senator has raised that point. The question I am speaking of came up at the General Assembly, and General Smuts, one of the great statesmen of the world, made a speech in which he said it would be wrong for the United Nations to assume that they had the right to discuss this matter without referring it to the International Court of Justice, and the Indian delegate got up and swept the

assembly. It is a difficult matter, because there are eight million coloured people in India. I am not referring to Indians. There are about 250,000 people of Indian descent, and the remainder of the eight millions are natives. I suppose grave difficulties would arise if certain privileges were given to these natives and withheld from the people of Indian descent. One result of that discussion was that India broke off trade relations with South Africa, and these have not yet been resumed.

When I was at New York I could not help feeling that the term "Big Six" should be substituted for "Big Five"; that is to say, that India should be added to the present list of big powers: the United Kingdom, the United States, France, China and Russia. I do not believe we can overestimate the influence of 340,000,000 people on the future of the world. For my part I am proud of the tolerance that we have in this country, and I hope that whatever racial discrimination still exists under our laws will be given very serious consideration in Parliament.

When I returned to our country, with its relatively small population of twelve millions, I could not help being impressed by the immensity of the problems in those eastern countries with their billions of people. I wondered what we as members of our parliament could do to help along the general cause of world peace. Just before I left New York I felt that, after all, the responsibility rests not entirely on governments, but on all peoples everywhere. I thought in particular of three delegates with whom I became as closely associated as was possible in view of the difficulties of language. On my left was Mr. Shmigov of Byelorussia, who spoke no English but a little French. A gentleman with whom I became very friendly was Sir Maharaj Singh, from India. He is a graduate of Cambridge University and highly cultured. He had very strong opinions on some questions, but nevertheless he was a delightful man to talk to, and very broad in his viewpoints. Then there was Mr. Liu, the Chinese Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs. I liked these gentlemen.

It happened that the honourable senator from Kennebec (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt) sent to me at New York some small boxes of maple sugar. Honourable members have seen these one-pound boxes, made up in the shape of the maple leaf. I restrained the natural impulse to use the sugar myself and asked my wife to make the same sacrifice, and I sent one box each to those three representatives of Byelorussia, India and China. Accompanying each box was a letter, in which I said I was sure that the people of my country, Canada, desired to