

great future; its potential wealth is immeasurable; but it is most important that the rules and regulations by which these resources are developed shall be sound and fair to all concerned, not forgetting the man who risks his capital.

For these reasons, I think it would have been the part of wisdom and fairness to delay some sections of the legislation for further study next session, until Canadian businessmen, through their associations, had more time to make their representations, as they requested.

I felt, honourable members, that I should place this statement on our records.

**Hon. Mr. Farris:** Honourable senators, as acting chairman of the committee I should perhaps say a word. I endorse everything that my friend from Northumberland (Hon. Mr. Burchill) has said, with perhaps one exception. I endorse first his very clear statement of the great importance of industry in this country, for it is essential to our very existence. And no one will challenge what he said about the high character of the men who lead in industry in Canada.

Also, I am in sympathy with his remarks about the MacQuarrie Committee. The members of that committee were of the highest standing. The Chairman, Mr. Justice MacQuarrie, was a lawyer of distinction, and a former attorney general of Nova Scotia, but I doubt whether the directors of any well established or newly formed industry would consider appointing him as its manager. His four associates are distinguished in economic life; university men of high standing and a great capacity for clear thinking. But I doubt if any honourable senator would want to put his money into a company which any one of those gentlemen managed and for whose payroll he was responsible.

I feel that one should contrast that kind of commission with one that might have been established to deal with the affairs of labour in this country. After all, this commission was dealing with the most vital things of industry. I ask honourable senators to picture a commission with the authority and power that this commission had in respect of industry, but acting in a similar way with regard to labour questions, and not a single labour man on it. I venture to say that if such a thing had happened there would have gone up in this country a roar of protest that could not have been resisted. In freely making that observation I may say that, as a lifelong Liberal and, as far as I can now see, one who expects to remain a Liberal for the

rest of his days, I am usually a little apprehensive when making remarks that may savour of criticism of the government, lest one of its opponents may say, "Look at this old gray-haired Liberal, and listen to what he says about the Liberal party!" But I feel no such apprehension in this instance, honourable senators, because my remarks apply equally to all parties. I venture to say that if industry had as many votes as labour has, the attitude taken on this question would have been entirely different.

While I do not feel competent to attack the bill, neither do I feel that I would be prepared to accept it solely on the report of a commission—particularly when it did not fully represent all the viewpoints affected—regardless of how long it sat and how carefully it studied the matter before it. Having gone that far, honourable senators, I would point out that the House of Commons unanimously endorsed this bill before it was amended by our committee. The committee had the choice of either complying with the suggestion that the bill be flatly rejected for this session and allowed to go over to the fall, or of offering amendments to the bill as it came to us. The general opinion of the committee was sound, I think, in view of the fact that for two years or more this subject has been before the commission or before the government; and that full opportunity had been given to members of Parliament of every party, and to all interested persons, to make representations. If they did not choose to avail themselves of the opportunity, that is their responsibility. But when the measure was before the other house, the elected representatives of the people supported it unanimously. Our duty, therefore, was to do exactly what we did.

The Minister of Justice appeared before the committee and spent some time in a frank and open discussion; he expressed his views fully, and answered every question that was asked of him. We made suggestions by way of amendment, some of which the Minister was reluctant to accede to; but in the end he was in complete agreement with the amendments that were made. I think we materially improved the bill, and that we went as far as the members of an appointed body should go in dealing with legislation of this kind.

In my opinion this house should have no hesitation in adopting the bill as amended.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, the motion is for concurrence in the amendments made by the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce to Bill 306, an Act to amend the Combines Investigation