

*Human Rights*

realize that Canadian civilization draws its ideas on this extremely important question primarily from Great Britain and France and also to a lesser extent from a number of other countries.

When the Prime Minister was speaking, thinking in terms of history I could not help recalling my reading of the experiences of the Topuddle martyrs, of Keir Hardie's life, of the contributions that Mr. Campbell Bannerman and Mr. Lloyd George, former prime ministers of Great Britain, made to this question in the House of Commons in London and in British public life, and also some well-known, important Tories. I would not for one moment suggest that throughout the years members of one party had been the only persons to defend human rights and fundamental freedoms.

I would not for a moment suggest that members of one party have been the only persons to defend human rights and fundamental freedoms, because I am sure many of us have read of the activities of the Duchess of Atholl, a well-known Tory in some respects, who took a great interest in this question. Then there was the Countess of Warwick, a Tory in many respects in her early days until she was influenced by some evangelical preacher and socialist contacts. She was another aristocrat who became interested in the preservation of fundamental rights and human freedoms.

I think that at this point it would be appropriate to mention that there seems to be some instinct among the British peoples in all parties which causes them to recognize the value of democracy and to understand the meaning of freedom and its foundations. I think it would be appropriate at this time in view of the unfortunate death of the Right Hon. Aneurin Bevan to mention that I heard him speak in the House of Commons in November, 1946, when he paid a magnificent tribute to the Right Hon. Winston Churchill. Mr. Churchill was then on the first seat to the right of the front government benches. I was in the gallery, listening with interest, and I heard Mr. Bevan pay tribute to the former prime minister of Great Britain. During most of the time Mr. Bevan was speaking the former prime minister was applauding most heartily. I think this indicates the essence of what democracy stands for, when two men, at opposite ends of the poll as far as economics and, possibly, as far as social origins are concerned, are willing to pay tribute to each other's ability and to the contribution they have made to the country and to the welfare of the state.

At the same time I had the happy experience of being entertained at the Hurlingham club. I am not used to going to such

places, because I am a humble person, but I was invited one Sunday by members of the House of Lords who kindly put on a special dinner for me at the club. I had an interesting time explaining the Canadian situation to them and explaining what the C.C.F. stood for and its position in relation to the Labour party. I remember one ancient peer—he was a member of the peerage, not the beirage—saying this, this incident comes to mind because it is connected with Mr. Aneurin Bevan: He said: "you know, that man has said some very annoying things on occasions, at times some nasty things but really he is a very decent fellow. He is very honest, he has strong socialist convictions but he is a sound democrat. You know, he is an excellent chap to go on a party with once in a while." That, I think, could only happen in a country like Great Britain where the principles we have talked about here in the last two or three days are respected, and practised.

To return to Canadian history, I think no one who has spoken so far in this debate has mentioned names of persons in recent Canadian history who have been staunch defenders of human rights and fundamental freedoms. I am sure everyone would wish mention to be made of the late Mr. J. S. Woodsworth's magnificent contribution and in particular his fight in opposition to section 98 of the Criminal Code during and after the Winnipeg strike—a man who went to jail because he believed in human rights. Then there was William Irvine who served in this house for a good many years. He is still active, and I understand that at the present time he is travelling abroad in order to extend his knowledge of international conditions and world affairs. I could also mention the father of the present hon. member for Vancouver East, Mr. Ernest Winch, who spent all his life in support of the principles we are discussing this afternoon.

We all know, in more recent years particularly, of the stand taken by Mr. M. J. Coldwell and his defence of the principles about which we are now speaking, and I wish, also, to give credit to the Senate, because I like to give credit where it is due. I was delighted last year when the Senate took a strong stand in opposition to representatives of the private power companies of British Columbia who came to the Senate committee and urged it to recommend an amendment to an act which had been passed by this parliament. The act provided in one of its sections that taxation of the export of power should be by law instead of by order in council. These private power companies came to the Senate committee and urged that this should be changed so that