

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Mr. Diefenbaker's later suggestion was that the attorneys general send their briefs to the Minister of Justice. Surely that would be helpful to us for next session if the committee is appointed. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Diefenbaker's suggestion.

Mr. CROLL: Mr. Chairman, it is surely clear that we can never hope to recommend a bill without hearing from the attorneys general; sooner or later we must hear from them and get their views. We might as well ask for their views and know what they are and have them before the committee sits, because the committee will have to have that information.

As far as the law societies are concerned, that is another matter entirely and will be something for our guidance, but the other matter will be something that will be a directive. We shall have to take that into serious consideration before we decide what to do, but we must have that information sooner or later, and we might as well go on and ask for it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I have no objection to getting briefs from the attorneys general or the law societies or the universities or anyone else, provided that after we have these briefs we have an opportunity to ask questions of those people. As I understood Mr. Diefenbaker's suggestion it did not extend to the point of inviting those people to come here and discuss this matter across the table with us.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I wanted to get their views. Other matters could be decided later. The Minister of Justice would have the views and the representations.

The CHAIRMAN: This committee will be out of existence within a week or two; then, with whom will they communicate? It seems to me that for the resolution to be practicable there would have to be a recommendation in the report that the government give consideration to inviting views of attorneys general and law societies, because there would be no committee, there would be no chairman of this committee and there would be no clerk, and there would be nobody else to whom these people could write in the recess.

Mr. HANSELL: That is practicable.

Mr. MICHAUD: If this suggestion goes through you would invite the provinces—the attorneys general of the different provinces—and the different law schools to express their views. Would that be on the constitutional aspect of a bill of rights—views somewhat in opposition to those expressed by Mr. Varcoe—or would they submit what they think should be a bill of rights?

The CHAIRMAN: Both. I do not think the resolution is particularly well drafted. As I understand it, we would ask them to express their views as to the powers of the dominion to enact a bill of rights; then if they have the opinion that we have powers, what the bill of rights should contain. I do not think this committee should start in on a course of correspondence with attorneys general and heads of law schools if the committee itself is out of existence; I think it is a matter for recommendation to the government.

Mr. CROLL: All right. Can we go this far? Write and tell them that this matter was discussed and that in all probability they will be called upon to give their views early in the next session so that they could give the matter some thought and not take up a couple of months answering by letter. It is a matter of some consequence both to the law schools and the various attorneys general. We advise them now that the committee will be going out of existence, but that a new committee will probably ask them for that information.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be all right.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: I am assuming that any steps we take now in regard to the matter under discussion for finding out legal viewpoints will be based on that part of our terms of reference which comes near the end. I am reading now from *Hansard* of May 16th.