

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the honourable the mover (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) that the name of the Honourable Senator Haig be withdrawn from his motion?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: It is not with pleasure that I withdraw it, but quite the reverse. I had hoped that the leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) would be a member of the committee, but I fully appreciate the difficulties under which he works and the very many calls on his time so, with regret, I withdraw his name.

Honourable senators will recall that in the closing hours of the last session of parliament I withdrew my resolution on human rights and fundamental freedoms on the expressed understanding that I would introduce it in somewhat different form at the next session.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will the honourable gentleman excuse me? My attention has been called to Rule 31, which reads:

A motion or amendment not seconded cannot be debated or put from the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I overlooked naming the seconder. The honourable gentleman from Queen's-Lunenburg (Hon. Mr. Kinley) seconds the motion.

The resolution of last year was debated throughout the session, and a good many masterly addresses were delivered by my colleagues, addresses containing noble thoughts expressed in the most exalted language. That resolution proposed a reference of the subject of human rights to the then forthcoming dominion-provincial conference. Some honourable senators questioned the advisability of such procedure, though we appear to be unanimous in our view that human beings, irrespective of race, colour or creed, have rights which should be respected, fundamental freedoms which should be preserved. Basically, we in this house are all for equality and freedom—at least in theory. What "buts" will appear when we proceed to put these lofty principles into practice is another matter. At the conclusion of the last session of parliament we had not progressed that far. So it was with this happy unanimity in mind that I drew the resolution which now appears on the order paper.

Honourable senators will observe that the resolution does not make any reference to the dominion-provincial conference, which I presume will take place this fall, or indeed any direct suggestion as to amending the Canadian constitution. What I ask is that a committee of this house consider and report on the subject of human rights and fundamental freedoms, what they are and how

they may be protected and preserved. I ask that the committee consider what steps may be taken to assure such rights to all persons in Canada. This leaves the committee free to advise such steps as seem wise under all the circumstances. I have set out in the resolution, as I did last session, a number of articles based upon the United Nations declaration adopted at Lake Success, which I assume will form the basis for the discussion of the committee.

I of course fully realize that honourable senators, and many people outside this chamber, may wonder why I take so keen an interest in this subject. If I may be permitted, I shall endeavour to tell you the reason for my interest. I am a liberal. The first principle of liberalism in respect for the rights of the individual. The dangers which the world is facing today flow from two opposite sources: privilege, as promoted by those on the right, and socialistic worship of the state to the utter disregard of the rights of the individual, as promoted by those on the left. Old-time tory privilege, with its assumptions of superiority by some over the mass of mankind, with its landlordism, its claim to ownership of the gifts of nature, its denial of equality, both economical and political, is bad enough, God knows; but I doubt whether this side of the story is as bad as the other side. This attitude of privilege has cursed the world with tyranny, oppression, untold poverty, cruelty, and woe, but the modern idolatry of the worship of the state may be even worse. The Nazi philosophy, which knows not of either mine or thine, and would reform the world by giving authority to those in power to override the natural or moral rights of all of us, invites a condition of tyranny such as we saw in Italy under Mussolini, in Germany under Hitler, and now see in Russia under Stalin.

I have always deeply regretted the weakness of the intellectual and reform movement during my lifetime, which has resulted largely from two great wars and several small ones. Social arrangements are far from ideal, but apparently the only crusaders of whom we hear today are the Socialists. Their movement is based upon discontent, engendered by the injustice which is so manifest in our economic arrangements. People are prone to fly from the evils they know to those they wot not of.

In my opinion, honourable senators, the most effective reply to the evils of privilege on the one hand and of socialistic totalitarianism on the other is a respect for individual rights and freedom. That is fundamental; and one of my reasons for having moved this resolution last session and again this year is to attempt to "keep the ball in the air", to