

Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance. In view of a Reuters despatch from London, published in the *Ottawa Journal* of Friday last, to the effect that the purpose of the flying visit of Mr. Graham Towers to England was to discuss, first, a second loan from Canada; second, reimposition of certain Canadian wartime import and export controls in an effort to stabilize Canada's position should the world dollar crisis become more serious, is the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance prepared to make a statement to the house at this time?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may say to my hon. friend that the Minister of Finance is unavoidably absent today but he will be in the house tomorrow and I know the minister has in mind answering that question at that time.

HUMAN RIGHTS

FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS—OBLIGATIONS UNDER UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

The house resumed from Friday, May 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mackenzie that the house go into committee on a resolution for the appointment of a joint committee of both houses of parliament to consider the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to conclude the remarks I was making when the house adjourned on Friday evening, but before I do so may I in a sentence or two express my gratitude to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government for the announcement made this afternoon with respect to the Montreal neurological institute. I am sure that all those who know anything about the work of this institution, particularly its work in the field of research and what it means to human kind, will feel proud not only that Canada has such an institution within our boundaries but that the government is now prepared to render the financial assistance that has been announced this afternoon.

When I was speaking on Friday evening in the course of this debate I made clear my whole-hearted support of the contention that the time has come for getting down in black and white the freedoms and the liberties that we so cherish in this democracy. As part of my argument I recounted some of the threats to liberty which we have experienced in recent years and which now make it necessary

to set aside the negative precedents that we have had by a clear declaration of the rights of Canadians. As I concluded on Friday evening I suggested that, in addition to the obvious threats to our liberties, there are other threats perhaps not so obvious but, in my view, even more sinister.

I think, first of all, of the confusion of thought that exists with reference to this whole question of liberty and freedom. I regret to do so, but I am bound to say I felt that that confusion was exhibited by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) who introduced this motion. We all enjoyed the fine speech that he made, and we could not help but feel that he spoke with deep emotion and with a deep love for the concept of liberty and freedom. Yet somehow or another it is possible for that same minister not to realize the danger there is to freedom when we put upon our statute books a law that denies to certain Canadian citizens, merely because of their Japanese racial origin, rights enjoyed by others. That confusion exists in a number of ways in this country, and the tragedy is that it is found not amongst those who do not care about liberty but amongst those who claim to espouse its cause. We have, for example, people who say they want to preserve our democratic traditions and the heritage we have gained from the people across the seas, particularly in the United Kingdom, and yet they want to deny freedom of speech to people who may hold differing political ideas. We in this group have no use, for example, for the communist party in this county or for the things that they would try to do. But we want to make it quite clear that if you are going to stand for freedom of speech you have to stand for it in all cases. Certainly anyone who breaks the law should be treated accordingly. Certainly anyone who advocates the overthrow of democracy by force is going beyond the bounds of free speech, but within those bounds we suggest that to deny freedom of speech is to scuttle the whole principle for which democracy stands.

I am sure that most of us in this house were disturbed over the week-end by the reports that came from Toronto of people there who felt that the great singer, Paul Robeson, should be denied the chance to speak in the midst of a concert that he was giving there on Saturday night. No matter how it is dressed up; no matter how one tries to say it was a concert and not a public address, the fact is that the news has gone around the world that an attempt has been made in Canada to deny Paul Robeson the