

what went into building this nation, what it is and what it may become. Canada's past has been favourable, in that order has prevailed without civil war and major disaster, so our future also can be bright and prosperous. The greatest danger lies in the belief that our present well-being justifies complacency. The future of Canada will rest on whether we approach change on the basis of a thorough understanding of our foundation and of our expectations.

We have inherited in trust a potential for greatness which must be passed on to future generations. Just as John Cabot was an explorer, so are we, but in spirit and expectation. We must continue to explore democracy's mandate to make this bountiful land better; by discovering new ways of living with others. The spirit of exploration, whether it is exploration of the surface of the earth or of the principles of living, includes developing the capacity to face trouble with courage, to meet disappointment with cheerfulness and to accept success with humility. Our patriotism and faith in democracy requires a spirit that holds the community together by giving its citizens a sense of sharing something as unique as the Canadian flag. Although it is debatable whether the present design is best, it is now generally accepted as Canadian.

We may have different personal traditions, cultures, religions, backgrounds or earning powers, but we all believe ourselves to be vital parts of the Canadian society. This does not mean being patriotic in the sense of believing that our country, province or county, is superior to all others just because we were born here or live here. True love of one's country is not the emotional luxury of vanity expressing itself in flag waving, but a sentiment expressed by a firm stand in the name of one's country's principles. It is living together, sharing of goals in common, enthusiastic planning of effective means to reach goals, an aggressive and efficient team action to make goals become realities.

In our democracy, we should seek a spirit within individuals, not a piece of governmental machinery to hold people together. The picture of a democratic country is one of self-reliant individuals who want to be allowed to do their own work, but who are also closely bound together by the great common aim that everyone seeks to devote himself to his country's good.

When looking at Canada's constitutional patriation, one finds it is necessary to cut through attitudes and prejudices which have built up for generations, and to look at the facts as they are and then to join others to fix what is faulty and to expand what is good. This approach brings together people of all races, languages, political parties and even religions in the realization of their ability to change this large and diverse land. History shows that the break-up of Canada into smaller states would be like blowing out candles in a castle until all is dark. It is clear that prosperity results when pious, law-abiding and industrial people develop a civilization, but civilization will fall apart in the midst of petty bickering.

Culture is more than the ability to perform or to admire the arts; it is the superiority of thought, the enjoyment of beauty, efforts to raise oneself and others to a higher level. It implies openness of mind, a sensitive appreciation of human values and

the development of the potential which each individual has within him. Canada needs leadership in church, university and the community, and we need governments with vision and with the unbiased ability to engender in Canadians a strong national feeling and a wish for individual advancement. Certainly Sir John A. Macdonald and John Diefenbaker had this ability. It is not so much a new ideology that is needed, as an earnest spirit which will sustain the people of this great nation in seeking a good life in this wonderful land.

I myself cannot define, and I doubt whether anyone else can, exactly what should be contained in a Constitution or charter of rights simply because the rights which it should contain can be argued endlessly. A charter of rights would give people a feeling of security and be an integrating force which would bring people together. However, it must not be taken for granted that in itself it will forever guarantee freedom to individuals. There are many examples where this is not the case. A nation such as Canada is unique and is in itself an ethnic and cultural entity tied together by such forces as language, history, technology and outlook.

Many countries in the world today have written constitutions using all kinds of grand wording and slogans and containing elaborate bills of rights. There is more to creating a just and workable constitution than putting it into words. Attempts by many countries to translate into chapter and verse a system which has taken our system many centuries to develop has led to disappointing results. Great Britain has no written constitution, yet it enjoys constitutional government with limited and accountable rule. Many would argue that the fundamental laws of Great Britain, along with a basic national consensus, are in reality more real constitution which is more frequently observed in practice than most other written and codified constitutions.

The supreme laws of Britain and Canada are perhaps most aptly described in Rousseau's words: "Not graven in tablets or brass, but on the hearts of the citizen".

A national constitution could be described as an official grouping of principles and rules which set out the sources, uses, purposes and restraints of public power. To this end, constitutional studies should look beyond written documents to constitutional practices, judicial interpretations, general laws, customs and tradition.

In Great Britain, over centuries of time, concern for maintaining the fundamental rights which we take for granted today grew together with the growth of democratic government. Britain has no written constitution, and no declaration of the liberties of the individual exists in British law. The principles set out in such historic documents as the Magna Carta of 1215, the Petition of Right of 1628, the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, the Bill of Rights of 1689, and the Act of Settlement of 1701 form a basis for the English constitution within which the government must show due regard for the rights and liberties of the citizen.

The basic rights in these conventions may be defined as the right to personal security, the right to personal liberty and the right to own private property. Under the British system, a