

Committee of the United Nations, the report uses these words:

Although not legally binding upon States, such a document, being a statement of principles, will tend to influence the course of legislation in States which consider themselves morally bound by its provisions, and will, therefore, promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Had we proceeded to declare great principles, rather than to content ourselves with legal subtleties, we might now say, as did Bishop Latimer in 1556 when the flames of martyrdom engulfed him:

We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out.

Canada has just fought a tragic and costly war in the defence of civil rights and fundamental freedoms. Is the Parliament of Canada now to say that we do not know what they are, or that what we fought for is so nebulous in our mind that we cannot put our principles into words?

This committee had it in its hands to declare, to Canada and to the world, a charter of Canadian liberty. It could have phrased exalted thoughts, if it had had any, in majestic words that might have rung in the ears of generations to come, and admonished judges and guided statesmen, in this and other lands, from this time on.

For two years your committee has deliberated, and this uninspiring, drab and negative confession of ineptitude is the armour of freedom it has forged. For two years the mountain has laboured—and it has brought forth this mouse.

Do you wonder that I say I am disappointed? I am voicing these views because I know that this miserable report is not the last of this subject, not the last of the struggle for freedom or of resistance to tyranny. I believe this committee capable of much better things, and I now express the hope that it will be given another opportunity at the next session of parliament to complete the task to which it was dedicated.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Aeltine the debate was adjourned.

## INDIAN ACT

### REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. IVA C. FALLIS: Honourable senators, as a member of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons appointed to examine into the Indian Act, the fact that concurrence in the committee's report has not been moved is rather disturbing to me. I

should like to know what will happen to the report if prorogation comes tonight.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: I was under the impression that the report was merely to be tabled for consideration in both houses of parliament; but I am not sure whether it was tabled in the other place. The honourable senator from Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Taylor), chairman of the Senate section of the committee, is not in his seat. There are two possible courses of action: one, to move concurrence in the report, and the other, to move that the report be tabled for the information of the house.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: The point that is bothering me is this. The report, of course, will go to the government for consideration before anything is done about it. I was wondering whether the report would have the same effectiveness if it were tabled as if it were adopted.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: So far as I know, there has been no discussion of the report in the other place, and I am not clear as to the present position of affairs with regard to it. If parliament should prorogue today, I might move at the conclusion of the sitting that the report be tabled; or if any member of the committee is more conversant with the subject than I am, and should desire to speak to the report, or, in the absence of the honourable senator from Norfolk, move that it be concurred in, I would have no objection.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I might point out that the report is printed in the Minutes of Proceedings under date of June 22.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: If we should adjourn until next week, we could leave the matter until then. If we should conclude our session today, I might ask leave of the house to have the report officially tabled. Is that suggestion acceptable to the honourable senator from Peterborough?

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: I am interested in knowing what would be the most effective way of bringing the report to the attention of the government. To drop it from the Order Paper does not seem the most satisfactory way of dealing with it.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Between now and the time we re-assemble I shall see what disposition has been made of the report in the other place, and recommend accordingly. Should there be a motion for concurrence, I would be at some disadvantage in trying to explain the contents of the report. Perhaps it would be sufficient to table it.