

True, we have industries owned by Americans, though often it is impossible to know who owns a huge organization now. If we assume they are owned by Americans, who gets the main benefit? We are told that the earnings from these industries go to the United States. What remains in Canada? The plant remains in Canada, the equipment, the wages paid out annually, the investments these industries make in municipal, provincial and Dominion bonds all remain in Canada; the municipal taxes on real estate and the provincial taxes on those industries remain in Canada; and a 48 per cent corporations tax remains in Canada.

When I hear people say that this country lives by exports, as it does, I sometimes wonder how many of those exports, what percentage and volume of them, derive from industries brought here by American investment. Take them away and see what exists.

This to me is one of the tragedies of political discussion in Canada—these constant attempts to pluck the feathers of the American eagle, spawned too often, I am afraid, by an inferiority complex.

I make no apology whatever for saying, "Thank God for the United States." I know that some of my friends have said that at one time I wanted to bar American magazines from Canada. I did nothing of the kind. The royal commission of which I happened to be the head made no such recommendation. Indeed, again and again in our report we regretted and repelled any attempt of those appearing before us to traffic in anti-Americanism.

When we look over the world today and of the past 25 years, when we remember the state of chaos in Europe after World War II and recall what the Marshall Plan did for Europe, rescuing it from disintegration—in the words of Winston Churchill, giving history its greatest example of a nation willing to sacrifice to save humanity as a whole—surely, honourable senators, we in this house, with the responsibility that devolves upon us, should try at all times to discourage this nightmarish nonsense about our sovereignty being imperilled by the United States.

I have said, I repeat—and am glad to repeat it—remembering the world we live in, thinking of the context of our world, thinking of what is happening in Europe and in Asia, we should get down on our knees every night and thank God for our American neighbours.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. O'Leary: I am not ashamed to repeat here the words that I used in closing my remarks in Houston: Vive le Canada! and God bless and save America!

On motion of Hon. Mr. Willis, debate adjourned.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

PROPOSED STUDY OF PROCEDURES BY LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, April 7, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Martin that the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs be instructed to consider and, from time to time, to report on procedures for the review by the Senate of instruments made in virtue of any statute of the Parliament of Canada, and to consider in connection therewith any public documents relevant thereto.

Hon. Muriel McQ. Fergusson: Honourable senators, with the consent of the house, I should like to speak to this debate.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed, honourable senators, that the honourable Senator Fergusson should now speak on this item instead of honourable Senator Fournier?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. Mrs. Fergusson: Honourable senators, the speeches up to the present in the debate on this resolution, which was so clearly, ably and informatively introduced by the Leader of the Government, have been of such a very high order, and some of them so erudite that I have some hesitation in participating in the debate.

Having been a federal civil servant for some years immediately before my appointment to this honourable house, I have thoughts on these matters which in view of some of the statements that have been made I would like to put before you. From my association as a civil servant with many civil servants, I have very different feelings toward and about what some of my colleagues term the "bureaucracy" from that which some members of this house appear to have.

We have been warned about the frightening things that civil servants could and might do to citizens and to the rights of citizens under regulations and orders-in-council which have the force of law although they have not been subject to the scrutiny of Parliament.