

*Supply—External Affairs*

racial non-discrimination. In view of that I find it difficult to understand why the Canadian vote was not cast in the third committee of the United Nations in favour of a resolution against discrimination. But, no, Canada abstained. The hon. member for Winnipeg South announced our abstention. The excuse given was that some constitutional principle in Canada would be infringed.

I have this resolution before me, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to read a portion of it to show the kind of resolution from which we abstained. I would ask why the government of Canada abstained. The resolution says, in part:

The general assembly,

Considering that the United Nations declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination provides that the United Nations, the specialized agencies, states and non-governmental organizations should do all in their power to ensure the abolition of all forms of discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin,

Considering the great importance of the speedy implementation of this declaration in order to liquidate all forms of racial discrimination as soon as possible,

Considering it essential that, as a step towards the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, the declaration should be made known throughout the world,

1. Requests that all states shall undertake all necessary measures in order to implement fully, faithfully and without delay the principles contained in the United Nations declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

The reason was, so it was said, because of article 9 of the resolution, which says:

1. All propaganda and organizations based on ideas or theories of the superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin with a view to justifying or promoting racial discrimination in any form shall be severely condemned.

2. All incitement to or acts of violence, whether by individuals or organizations, against any race or group of persons of another colour or ethnic origin shall be considered an offence against society and punishable under law.

3. In order to put into effect the purposes and principles of the present declaration, all states shall take immediate and positive measures, including legislative and other measures, to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote racial discrimination or incite to or use violence for purposes of discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin.

Canada abstained from voting and as a result got a black eye. The vote finally came up in the assembly. The question was also raised in this house, as I recall it, and the excuse, as I say, was that some constitutional principle was at stake. After a lot of argument in the United Nations someone finally suggested that a few words should be added, and in the passage which reads—

—to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote racial discrimination—

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

—they added the three words “or incite to” so that it read:

—to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote or incite to racial discrimination.

Then Canada voted in favour of the resolution, as did all the nations. I cannot understand why Canada abstained in the committee on a matter which is inherent in our constitution. This principle is inherent not only in our bill of rights, but it is one inherent in the stand taken by the commonwealth at the prime ministers' conference, and is now accepted throughout the commonwealth. It is true that two or three weeks afterwards, following some contemplation and the addition of those words, which are to say the least meaningless, there was a change of attitude. But I should like the minister to explain by what variety of aberration did Canada's representatives give to Canada internationally an image contrary to the basic principles of this country, namely freedom from discrimination. The *Christian Science Monitor* of November 22 has this to say:

The United States, indeed the entire western bloc, has just averted by a semantic eyelash a major collision with that two thirds of the world which is non-white.

Both the house and the country have the right to know why Canada took this stand. I received three or four letters from India, from Pakistan, from one country in Africa, asking me why Canada abstained on this question of non-discrimination. I am glad they took a second view of this, but it will take a long time to eradicate the effect of Canada, with regard to a resolution that commands the support of Canadians as a whole and would commend itself to all Canadians, abstaining on the basis of a comma or the absence of one or two words.

Mention was made by the minister of peacekeeping machinery. He did not go as far as he has gone on previous occasions in that connection. He has argued in the past that the United Nations should have a permanent force, but he did not go that far today. He spoke of improving the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. That is all to the good; but I do hope that before Canada arrives at any decision to support the setting up of an international United Nations force, parliament will have the opportunity of discussing it.

I am not speaking about these peacekeeping forces at all. When we were in office we designated one infantry battalion for service under the United Nations flag, and although Canada has since taken part in peacekeeping operations, the unit has never been used or called for. While the minister and the Prime