the United States defence department gave any indication that they intend to renew the lease for the air base which expires in June of next year? Is it Canada's intention to renew the lease, and can the minister tell us whether the 20-year lease signed in 1952 between Canada and the United States superceded the original 99-year lease signed in 1945 between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the United States government does not intend to declare this base surplus. Negotiations for a continuation of the lease are now under way.

• (12:00 noon)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

TEXTILE AND CLOTHING BOARD ACT

ESTABLISHMENT, INQUIRIES, REPORTS AND ASSISTANCE BENEFITS FOR WORKERS

The House resumed, from Thursday, January 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pepin that Bill C-215, to establish the Textile and Clothing Board and to make certain amendments to other acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to report to the House that conversations have been held with the leaders of the parties opposite in connection with the desire of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) to speak immediately after the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). It is evident that the remarks to be made by the Minister of Labour could benefit all members of the House, including hon. members opposite who will follow him in the debate, and it has been agreed that this somewhat unusual order should prevail in this instance.

Mr. Baldwin: That is correct. We are always interested in hearing the novel comments of the Minister of Labour.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Last night, Mr. Speaker, I divided my speech into three portions. First, I dealt with what has been going on since May 14 when I announced in the House the government's new textile policy. I talked about the creation of the board, about promotion efforts, about the voluntary restraint agreements which had been signed or are being negotiated.

Then, I started explaining the ideas embodied in the bill before us. I dealt with the composition of the board and the criteria upon which it would base its judgments. I explained the functions of the board. I emphasized that the board has final authority when it comes to determining whether there is injury or threat of injury, and when it comes to determining the value of plans presented by the industry, but that it does not have final responsibility in matters affecting the degree of protection needed. That is a field of government responsibility; the board only makes recommendations. Some people have misunderstood this point. Next I tried to describe the changes the bill proposes to make to the Export and Import Permits Act. This is where I was last night when the sitting came to an end.

The new textile policy envisages the application of unilateral measures, including import quotas, in cases where a negotiated solution, such as a restraint agreement, cannot be reached. As I said last night, we always try to reach a negotiated agreement with low-cost countries whenever possible. The amendment in the bill would enable the government to do this. However, the new subclause could be invoked only after a formal determination of injury by the Textile and Clothing Board in the case of textiles and clothing and by the Anti-dumping Tribunal in the case of all other goods. Moreover, any restrictions imposed under this clause would remain in force only for the period required to prevent or remedy an injury. It is clear, therefore, that action under this new subsection would be taken only when needed and would take into account the provisions of relevant international agreements.

I might emphasize in this connection that most other countries have standing authority to take unilateral action of this type. However, the approach taken by the Canadian government contrasts sharply with the policy pursued by other countries in that many of them do not require a formal determination of injury to be made before proceeding with restrictive action. I think this is extremely important, and I suggest that hon. members commenting on this subject should take these facts into account.

Incidentally, I am sure the proposed amendment will commend itself to the great majority of hon. members. When another amendment to this act was before the House in February, 1969, the spokesman for the Progressive Conservative party, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness) and for the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman), expressed a desire to see the act used more effectively and extended in terms of the products to which it applies.

A few words, now, about the changes in the Customs Act. There have been cases in the past where countries agree to restrain their exports in order to prevent a serious disruption of the Canadian market but were unable to do so effectively. I have in mind a voluntary restraint agreement with respect to which the country which had agreed to restrain was not in a position to implement the agreement it had accepted. As I indicated earlier, the new policy envisages continued reliance on negotiated restraint as the principal means of protecting against disruptive imports. However, such an approach