

which is hardly required when one realizes that in the Prime Minister of this country we have a gentleman of the highest order—that our report will receive courteous consideration. That is all we are entitled to, and, from my standpoint, all we want. No objection has been made to our proceeding as we have done and we are free to do what in our judgment seems wise. That is eminently satisfactory.

I am sorry that the honourable senator from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Bouffard) is not with us this morning, because I wished to thank him in person for the very kind remarks that he made with regard to our chairman and the other members of this committee. He said, "I have examined the report, and personally speaking I do not find anything that hurts anyone." Neither do I. "And I will be glad to see a bill of rights introduced and accepted by Canadians." But he thought we should not proceed too hastily. That is a fair comment, but I would point out that it is five years since the United Nations adopted its charter, with its references to human rights; it is two years since the universal declaration was adopted, and Canada voted for it. This is the second session of the Senate in which we have discussed this question. Last year the debate ran on from early in the session to its very close; and many splendid speeches of the highest order were made by honourable senators. Then, this session the motion was introduced in the early stages; and for eight days the committee heard representations by delegates of organizations with memberships running into hundreds of thousands, and by men of the highest standing in their respective communities. For three long evenings, the committee sat to consider its report. Every sentence, every thought, every word in it was weighed, discussed, debated and finally approved. I make that statement with a full realization of a fact which I deem most significant. On the committee were men of the two dominant faiths of this country—Protestant and Catholic. On it were representatives of Canadians of French origin and of Anglo-Saxon origin. Is it not significant that men whose upbringing in some respects were diverse, although in other respects similar, were able to agree on this most important and, I think, historic document?

Is it not significant that the members of French origin and members of English origin were able to agree on the broad positive statements contained in this report? This report is before you today on the authority of that committee, and not alone on my authority.

The honourable senator from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Bouffard) said that we should give

Canadians and various organizations who are interested in a Human Rights Bill an opportunity to study this report and make suggestions about it. As I have already indicated in my remarks about the report, that is exactly what we are doing. That is why we advised a declaration, and that is why we did not ourselves make a declaration. We suggested that the declaration and bill of rights be drawn by a carefully selected committee. Later on this committee's report could be discussed by people inside and outside this house, before any positive action is taken on the details of its recommendations. The honourable gentleman from Grandville said that the principles embodied in the report are definitely of a provincial nature. He mentioned two or three of the sections to be found in the resolution constituting the committee. But I wish to call his attention, and that of other honourable senators, to what is stated in the report.

Your committee was urged to recommend the incorporation into Canadian law of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Your committee finds, however, that the Universal Declaration, as its name implies, was drafted for general application and was not designed with special reference to Canadian conditions with our divided jurisdiction and individual history. This finding also applies to the draft articles appearing in the Senate Resolution, most of which are copied from the Universal Declaration. Witnesses before your Committee addressed themselves to the general principles of Human Rights and Freedoms and scarcely at all to the items in detail.

And please note this in particular:

Your Committee prefers to express its own thoughts as applied to Canadian problems rather than to attempt to base its report on these individual paragraphs.

Thus it may be seen that these individual paragraphs are not part of the report, and they are not included in our recommendations as set forth in the report. Any contention that these individual items mentioned by my colleague might, if adopted in a bill of rights, infringe provincial jurisdiction, has no application whatsoever to the problem now before us.

I presume that the drafters of a Declaration would be cognizant of what my honourable friend from Grandville has said and would act accordingly, because the report specifies in most emphatic terms that any Declaration which we adopt shall be strictly within our own jurisdiction. Those will be the instructions to such a committee. The honourable gentleman further said that if a man has subversive ideas, does not like our form of government and wishes to upset it, that we do not feel these people should have access to any public service in Canada. Well, men of that kind, racketeers like that, should have access to just one kind of public service, and that is of a warden of a jail. I have