

There is also another chapter in the constitution of the U.S.S.R. dealing with the electoral system, and I could not find anything in it to explain or justify what happened during the recent elections held in Poland, another Russian dominated nation. We all remember the strong but useless protests uttered at that time by one of the members of the Polish government.

For all these reasons, I think the time has come for the world to define in a clear declaration what it means by the rights and fundamental freedoms of nations and individuals.

And, Mr. Speaker, in spite of some events which may at times contribute to develop pessimism in the troubled sphere of international relations, I sincerely believe that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) found the right expression when he said at one of the meetings of the general assembly at New York:

Each state represented here has its own ideals, its own standards, its own ways of life. Differences of outlook are therefore inevitable. It is what we do about these differences that is crucial. Attempts to exploit them to the advantage of any nation or group of nations can accomplish nothing wholesome or constructive. Let us beware of recrimination, of charge and counter-charge. Let us, with good will, patience and forbearance, pursue the course which leads to resolution and not to exploitation of differences.

For these reasons, if for no other, I am firmly convinced that the proclamation of an international bill of rights will go a long way toward helping nations to attain that aim.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the house sets out a state of affairs which has been discussed in the house before. The resolution of the government is based upon the charter of the united nations, and it deals with human rights and fundamental freedoms. It proposes to appoint a committee of both houses of parliament to look into the matter so as to see what can be done.

Another related resolution, which was introduced by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), dealt with all the freedoms, including freedom of religion—which we hope we shall never lose in this country—freedom of speech, freedom from fear, freedom of the press, and the right of habeas corpus. There has now been added the right under which no one would be deprived of his liberty by order in council, or detained to give evidence without the benefit of counsel.

These resolutions were discussed in the session of 1937, on February 17. A resolution I placed before the house at that time pro-

posed the appointment of a committee to look into these freedoms. They are all based on four things. My resolution is based on these four things: parliamentary reform, constitutional reform, cabinet reform and law reform—and to a great extent the latter. A long discussion took place in the house on February 17, 1937, in which the then minister of justice took part.

So far so good. In its resolution now before the house the government seems to forget one fact, namely that by the Constitutional Act of 1791 so much of English law was copied into the constitution of Canada as was adapted to our circumstances. This included the provisions in respect of habeas corpus, the various acts which had come before the country, the rights under magna carta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights and the right of habeas corpus. All these things were included. Then came the Statute of Westminster.

All those matters were dealt with in the debate in that year. As I have said, the liberty of the subject is an important matter, and something which has been dearly bought in the old land. Many people have died for it, including Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer, who were burned at the stake. Then there were the seven bishops who won freedom.

I do not want the liberty of the subject to become a meaningless thing in this country. I said the other evening that in some places trial by jury was, to some extent, supplanted by trial by newspapers. Sometimes magistrates will remand prisoners for a week or two weeks until they make up their minds.

As I said before, we in the British commonwealth are very fortunate. Through our allegiance to the crown and to common ideals and interests and loyalties, this unseen link engenders a chain of mutual sympathy which has been moulded, and which has stood the strain of two long struggles for survival.

As Lord Chatham said in 1776, there is something behind the throne greater than the king himself. As I said in the house on September 11, 1941:

Every principle for which the British nation struggled in the old land since the 17th century has been surrendered to the political caucuses. Parliament itself, which came into being to ensure that taxes shall be voted only by those who have to pay them, has become the institution through which those who do not pay them impose them on others. I want to emphasize to the committee that powers of legislation older even than the right of taxpayers to determine the national expenditure have been surrendered, and if we are to continue this sort of thing, the power of parliament will be gone forever. Whole spheres of activity, involving the livelihood of every man, woman and child in this country, have been removed from the jurisdiction of the law and of parliament and reserved for the