

amendments, the American people expressed its belief in the Almighty, from whom is derived every right and every power.

I could refer to a number of other declarations or constitutions adopted by other countries, such as that of Eire, for instance; and in every one that I have consulted, the same faith in God and religion was reaffirmed. The only two documents I have consulted where such indispensable references were omitted, were the statement on essential human rights of the committee of the American Law Institute and the constitution of the U.S.S.R. In the case of the committee of the American Law Institute, I am convinced that the omission could be attributed to the absent-mindedness which is often the lot of legalistic scientists. But in the second case, the omission of reference to divine power in the Russian constitution is in perfect accordance with the policies followed by that country ever since.

May I make the wish that the new international bill of rights which our worried world is trying to create and proclaim will call for the protection of Him without Whom all our quests for peace would be vain? May I also express the hope that every nation will, in that respect, come to preach and follow the same doctrine toward a better conception by man of his duties toward God? The adoption of any other kind of bill of rights would be for the world a sad mistake and a miserable blunder.

I should like to be as categorical in discussing such articles of that statement on essential human rights as deal with the freedom of opinion and expression, the habeas corpus, the right to own property and the article which concerns the right of peoples to enjoy governments of their choice through democratic elections. As I have already said, I do not intend to discuss all the principles which, in my opinion, have to be embodied in an international bill of rights. It seems to me that theoretically they are all accepted by every nation. In fact, it is often the case that such principles are better praised and glorified precisely by such governments for which it has become common practice to violate them.

For instance, I have carefully read and studied the constitution of the U.S.S.R., and I must say that I have made startling discoveries. I am sure that an attentive reading of that document will be of definite interest to every one of us.

Embodied in the constitution itself is found a chapter entitled: "Fundamental rights and duties of citizens", which might justly be called the bill of rights of the Russian people, or at

least of the Russian government. It is interesting to read about the great principles defined in that declaration and to try to reconcile their application with so many events which took place in that country or behind the iron curtain in all Russian dominated countries.

One can learn, for example in that Russian document in article 125 that citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed by law freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly or street processions and demonstrations. And then he will recall so many events and occasions when such freedoms were constantly denied to so many Russians.

For instance, how could it be seriously contended that newspapers in Russia are allowed to comment on world or even domestic events with the same liberty and independence as is the case in our country or in any other democratic country whatever. If such contention was made, all we can say is that the Russian government is lucky indeed to find in all the newspapers of the U.S.S.R. such complete and unfaltering agreement and support. Even our great Liberal party in its most glorious days could never succeed in obtaining from Canadian newspapermen such decisive and constant help.

If it is a Canadian who reads such article of the Russian constitution, he will remember the recent declarations of Igor Gouzenko, a former Russian citizen, who could not in his heart and in his mind conceal any longer the real truth concerning the absence of liberty and freedom in his country.

In sections 127 and 128 is embodied the great principle that citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed inviolability of the person and that no person may be placed under arrest except by decision of a court of justice. I leave it to members of this house and to the public at large to reconcile that declaration of principle with what has happened in the U.S.S.R. in the past.

And coming to article 124 of the same constitution of the U.S.S.R. one cannot help being astonished to read that, if freedom of religious worship is recognized, freedom of anti-religious propaganda is also allowed to all citizens of that country. I may say that I know of no other country where freedom of anti-religious propaganda is especially mentioned and referred to in the constitution.

If one will recall, for instance, the trial and condemnation of Archbishop Stepinac by the courts of a Russian satellite, he will be inclined to think religion might be tolerated in those countries under Russian domination, but he will also believe that anti-religious propaganda is not only permitted but is strongly encouraged.

[Mr. Pinard.]