

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it should be amended to make the meaning clear, "requesting that the law schools and the attorneys-general give their opinion to the government"—is that right?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I said to the Minister of Justice.

The CHAIRMAN: On the question of the power of parliament to enact a comprehensive bill of rights.

Mr. HACKETT: If Mr. Diefenbaker is willing I think you should incorporate there some intimation that it is the hope of this committee that the committee which convenes next year will have the benefit of hearing these people in explanation of their opinions.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I will gladly do that.

Mr. CROLL: Would it not be wise to change the word "opinion" to "views"? I am looking at it from their point of view. Do you not think it should be "views" rather than "opinion"?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I do not care what the word is.

Mr. CROLL: All you want is an opinion. You do not care what they call it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Their views then, views and opinions.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I anticipate if the Minister of Justice sends a communication of this kind to the law societies and the attorneys-general he will immediately be asked, "what is meant by 'a comprehensive bill of rights'?" What does the word "comprehensive" mean as applied to this? Would it not be better to find something concrete and submit it to them. I have in mind, for instance, that you might submit to them the United States bill of rights and say, "Would you be favourable to the enactment in Canada of a similar bill of rights"? If you write to the attorneys-general I would not be surprised if the reply was, "Well, what do you mean by this thing"?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We will come to that when they do. They know very well what a comprehensive bill of rights is if they have followed what is going on in the world today in connection with the one in the United Nations alone aside from any other bill of rights.

The CHAIRMAN: I know what will happen. Under this motion the clerk of the committee is to communicate with them and ask them to send them their views to the Minister of Justice. If they write at all they will write asking what is meant.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Let them do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Then what authority have I?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Your authority is ended then, I presume, but at least they have had the opportunity.

Mr. HACKETT: I do not think you can do much more.

Mr. MICHAUD: You can refer them to the printed report of the committee.

Mr. HAZEN: Are there not other views we want besides their opinions on the powers of parliament to do this? The first part of our reference says to consider the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the manner in which those obligations accepted by all members of the United Nations may best be implemented. In some of these law schools there must be men who have a knowledge of international law and who would be interested in this phase of the matter. Would it not be advisable to enlarge the resolution to include obtaining their opinions on paragraph 1 (a) as contained in the first report of the steering committee? I am making that suggestion.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: You mean to substitute that for the term "bill of rights"?