

though such action is taken at our own instance." I ask my colleagues to note what the report goes on to say:

For these reasons, your committee is of opinion that it would be wise to await the time, which we hope is not far distant, when prospective dominion-provincial conferences will have worked out a method for the control within Canada of the Canadian Constitution, and agreement has been reached as to incorporation in the constitution of a national bill of rights.

Could anything be more explicit or moderate than that? Could anything provide more time for consideration or be more carefully designed to avoid possible conflict between jurisdictions?

The committee, recognizing that time will be required to bring about an amendment to our constitution by the method of concurrence, recommends:

That, as an interim measure, the Canadian parliament adopt a declaration—

not a bill—

—of human rights to be strictly limited to its own legislative jurisdiction.

That is all that the report advises, a declaration in the broadest terms.

Some opinion is expressed as to what might be included in such a declaration, and I call attention to the closing words in this paragraph of the report.

The Declaration would also state that every one in Canada has duties to our Community and is subject to such limitations as are determined by law, for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and of the general welfare and good government of Canada. Finally, the Declaration would specify that none of its provisions may be interpreted as tending to permit any group or person to engage in activity aimed at the destruction of the rights and freedoms of the people of Canada.

Could there be a more explicit statement that we are not advocating licence or subversive activities, or proposing in any way to give *carte blanche* to gangsters to rob their neighbours, or anything of that kind? It is explicitly stated that that is not the intention.

Then, though not so stated in the report, there is the assumption, which I suppose is a natural one, that in the course of time the declaration will be embodied in a bill. The report speaks of the adoption of a national bill of rights in "due time". What "due time" is I do not know, but it will not be until after a very much more thorough consideration than we have yet given to the details of a bill of rights. The report goes on to say that—

A bill of rights, whether statutory or constitutional, should be carefully though courageously drawn. Your committee recommends that the task be referred to a carefully selected committee.

So, you see, we are not proposing today the adoption of a detailed bill of rights. The only thing before the house is a resolution that

we should approve in general terms these professions of liberty, freedom, security, and so on, in which every member, without an exception, believes.

We state that—

What is required in Canada is one grand and comprehensive affirmation, or reaffirmation, of human rights, equality before the law and of security, as the philosophical foundation of our nationhood.

Who could possibly disagree with that?

Thus will Canadians know of their freedom, exercise it in manly confidence and be proud of their country.

Obviously we do need something of that kind, not so much for ourselves in this chamber but, particularly, for the newcomer to our shores who has not a full knowledge of our history or any good grasp of our political philosophy.

In conclusion, is this suggestion:

The enactment of a Bill of Rights is not however the last requisite to a free and just society. While individuals and groups have natural rights, they have also responsibilities. Individuals who practise discrimination, who in their daily life invade the fundamental rights of others, should pause to remember that this is Canada, a Christian country in which the spirit of fairness, kindness, courtesy and understanding is the basis of our well-being and happiness.

I am proud to be associated with a sentiment of that kind, and I submit it with confidence to my fellow senators.

Your Committee concludes its report by further recommending that all men give thought to the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, so that by common consent the rule of law and liberty be more fully established and more universally practised to the end that the rights of the individual be recognized and respected and the well-being, dignity and security of all humanity be thus preserved.

That is all there is in this report. What is not in the report is another matter; and I wish to comment very briefly on some of the remarks made by some of my respected colleagues who were not members of the committee.

The deputy leader of the house stated yesterday afternoon that the leader had advised him that he had not had time to consult with his colleagues and that therefore the government could take no attitude with respect to this report. That stand is entirely satisfactory to me. I think it is absolutely sound. The report is of the nature of representations to the government and possibly to others. I do not see why the government should concur in it in advance. The most that we should ask of the government, we have received; that is to say, every facility for carrying on the investigation and writing the report; no interference, not even a suggestion from the executive, with regard to it; a welcome and a kind word; and the assurance—