

eighteen articles preceded by a short preamble, it summarizes well the essential liberties and fundamental freedoms of nations as well as individuals living in society.

I do not intend to discuss at length the clauses or declarations contained in that statement, which might well be considered as the proposed international bill of rights. But I wish to make a few remarks with regard to some of the principles embodied in that statement on essential human rights and also to refer to some of its deficiencies. First, I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to an omission of prime importance in that statement on human rights as prepared by the committee of the American Law Institute. The task of that committee, composed of legal and political scientists from all important cultures of the world was, as I said, to prepare a declaration containing a summary of the essential rights of human beings. We all know—and this could only be denied by a certain group of people whose blindness or bad faith has misguided them into the desolate regions of atheism, agnosticism or proud nationalism—that all rights whatever are not conferred by man, but must originate and derive from God. In our troubled world of today, when everything seems to be confused and when doctrines of all sorts assail the minds of us all, the only intangible principle dominating all the others should be enunciated in such declaration on human rights.

In other words—and I want to be emphatic on that point—no international declaration on human rights and the rights and duties of states should be approved by the united nations and by Canada in particular, unless faith in God and also belief in religion are firmly and clearly expressed therein. Many people seem to consider the separation of church and state as indispensable to the security of a nation. They would, of course, also be of the opinion that the same principle should apply to international relations.

This group of people would consequently advocate complete exclusion of religion, not only from schools or governmental organizations, but also from international meetings. Wherever such policy was applied, past experience has shown disastrous results. It is a fact that religious hate or even religious illiteracy always becomes an enemy to progress, to national security and also to the maintenance of international peace.

I read the other day some excerpts from an interesting United States publication called the "Relation of Religion to Public Education." This book was published by the American council on education, and it con-

tains the report and conclusions of a committee appointed by such council. The committee, after more than two years of deliberation and study, came to the conclusion that schools should accept the teaching of religion as a factor of social life. I have found the following remarks very constructive:

On all sides we see the disintegration of loyalties . . . the revival of ancient prejudices, the increase of frustrations, the eclipse of hope. . . . Religion at its best has always been an integrating force, a spiritual tonic for a soul racked by fear and cringing in weakness. . . . Its imperfections will not be lessened by an attitude of splendid isolation on the part of intellectuals, or of indifference on the part of those responsible for the education of youth.

After the horrible catastrophe of the last war, all men of good will must again return to the eternal truth if they are to succeed in their efforts toward better international realities and the maintenance of peace.

I do not wish to confuse the issue when I express such an opinion, and I am completely at ease in speaking in that way when I review the experiences of the past. If one examines with attention those declarations of rights which at times have constituted halting places in the history of mankind, he will discover that they contained in their preamble such reference to the divine power, dispenser of all rights. Such reference is found in magna carta, the Bill of Rights of 1688, which constitute the declaration of principles so precious to British people. It is also clearly expressed in all the great charters of rights that the French people have at certain intervals adopted for their guidance. The most important of such French documents is undoubtedly the famous declaration of rights in 1789, which, written in the blood of the revolution, became a symbol for the first republic of France. Although it seemed that the leaders of the revolution wanted to crush religion at the same time as aristocracy, Robespierre insisted, before having the "déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen" adopted by the national assembly, that reference be made in the preamble to divine authority. So it was "in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being" that the national assembly adopted the solemn declaration. And on October 30, 1946, when France proposed its last constitution of the fourth republic, reference was again made to the principles of 1789, and the constitution reaffirmed the same social, economic and political principles.

In the United States both the declaration of independence and the constitution and its