

not inconsistent with these articles is the right of every one. The state has a duty to protect this freedom.

Article 6. Freedom from unreasonable interference with the person, home, reputation, privacy, activities and property is the right of every one. The state has a duty to protect this freedom.

Article 7. Everyone has the right to have his criminal and civil liabilities and his rights determined without undue delay by fair public trial by a competent tribunal before which he has opportunity for a full hearing. The state has a duty to maintain adequate tribunals and procedures to make this right effective.

Article 8. Every one who is detained has the right to immediate judicial determination of the legality of his detention. The state has a duty to provide adequate procedures to make this right effective.

Article 9. No one shall be convicted of crime except for violation of a law in effect at the time of the commission of the act charged as an offence, nor be subjected to a penalty greater than that applicable at the time of the commission of the offence.

Article 10. Every one has the right to own property under general law. The state shall not deprive any one of his property except for a public purpose and with just compensation.

Article 11. Every one has the right to education. The state has a duty to require that every child within its jurisdiction receive education of the primary standard; to maintain or insure that there are maintained facilities for such education which are adequate and free; and to promote the development of facilities for further education which are adequate and effectively available to all its residents.

Article 12. Every one has the right to work. The state has a duty to take such measures as may be necessary to insure that all its residents have an opportunity for useful work.

Article 13. Every one has the right to reasonable conditions of work. The state has a duty to take such measures as may be necessary to insure reasonable wages, hours and other conditions of work.

Article 14. Every one has the right to adequate food and housing. The state has a duty to take such measures as may be necessary to insure that all its residents have an opportunity to obtain these essentials.

Article 15. Every one has the right to social security. The state has a duty to maintain or insure that there are maintained comprehensive arrangements for the protection of health, for the prevention of sickness and accident, and for the provision of medical care and of compensation for loss of livelihood.

Article 16. Every one has the right to take part in the government of his state. The state has a duty to conform to the will of the people as manifested by democratic elections.

Article 17. Every one has the right of protection against arbitrary discrimination in the provisions and application of the law because of race, religion, sex or any other reason.

Article 18. In the exercise of his rights every one is limited by the rights of others and by the just requirements of the democratic state.

That concludes the quotation. I feel tempted to say just a word on that last division, article XVIII, inasmuch as several of our C.C.F. friends have been so greatly disturbed by reason of what some of us have said con-

cerning the Japanese problem. I believe it would be a right good thing for them to read that section very carefully, to ponder it deeply, apply it to our own case and see how it will work out in Canada.

On page 65 of the publication from which I have just read, we are told that this statement which I have read was drawn up during 1943 and 1944 by a committee of lawyers and political scientists consisting of the following gentlemen, whose names I believe the committee will be pleased to hear. They are:

Mr. Henri Laugier, who is now assistant secretary general of the united nations in charge of the department of social affairs;

Dr. P. E. Corbett, formerly of McGill university and now of Yale university;

Mr. C. Wilfred Jenks, legal adviser of the I.L.O.;

Dr. Rajchman of Poland;

Dr. Hu Shih of China;

Senor del Vayo of Spain; and

Professor Quincy Wright of the university of Chicago.

The statement was submitted to the general assembly by the delegation from Panama, as is recorded at page 217. By resolution of December 11, 1946, this draft was referred to the economic and social council for reference to the commission on human rights, for consideration by that commission in its preparation of an international bill of rights.

I feel tempted to say a word or two to the government regarding this bill of rights. If that bill of rights ever passes, and the government of this country undertakes to do what is suggested by the united nations, then the government will be adopting ways and means which have never yet been considered in this house or throughout this country. I think hon. members should be warned regarding that before they become quite consumed in their enthusiasm for the united nations.

In order to discharge to the full its responsibility suggested by this resolution, each and every state must evidently possess and exercise unchallengeable sovereignty. May I stop to comment at that point. To a great many in this house who have advocated so earnestly that Canada surrender some of her sovereignty, may I point out that if Canada surrendered essential sovereignty it would be a matter of utter impossibility for her to discharge the responsibilities which, by implication, are placed upon her by acceptance of that resolution.

Canada would have to have unchallengeable sovereignty over her economic system—over the goods and services she should produce and consume; unchallengeable sovereignty over her trading policy, to determine with whom she