

## DIVORCE

### BILLS—THIRD READINGS

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck** moved the third readings of the following bills:

Bill SD-15, for the relief of Olive-Jane Frances Piper Sinclair.

Bill SD-16, for the relief of Rhoda Carin Burack.

Bill SD-17, for the relief of Evelyn Grace Blakely Mullins.

Bill SD-18, for the relief of Julia Switnicki Kobel.

Bill SD-19 for the relief of Eric Dunstan Martin.

Bill SD-20 for the relief of Hazel Margaret White Jackson.

Bill SD-21 for the relief of Mary Stepko Berryman.

Bill SD-22 for the relief of Jewel Evelyn Bockus Yeo.

Bill SD-23, for the relief of Clarence Leonard Sproule.

Bill SD-24, for the relief of Geraldine Avonne Dixon McNaughton.

Bill SD-25, for the relief of Jean-Louis Ducharme.

Bill SD-26, for the relief of Emery George Nemeth.

Bill SD-27, for the relief of Alfreda Rose Celina Gigot Kyriazis.

Motion agreed to, and bills read third time and passed, on division.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

### MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY— DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Thursday, June 5, consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Monette, seconded by Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson, for an Address in reply thereto.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, since the commencement of this debate a number of senators have expressed in the finest of language and most acceptably, felicitations to you, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) and the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), and to the mover (Hon. Mr. Monette) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson) of the Address. These congratulations, and even expressions of admiration, have been voiced by a number of speakers. This, of course, is in the best traditions of Parliament and of this chamber, and, with the consent of the senators who expressed

these sentiments to which I refer, may I adopt their eloquent tributes, with a special bow to you, Mr. Speaker.

May I take advantage of the fact that I have the floor for the moment to say how pleased I am to see amongst us again my colleague from Halifax-Dartmouth (Hon. Mr. Isnor), after a siege of illness. We are all happy to see him back, and trust that he has completely recovered his health.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Isnor:** Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Congratulations are due not only to the five honourable senators I have mentioned, but also to those senators from whom we have heard during this debate excellent speeches containing much food for thought and couched in the finest language. Without any desire to choose one rather than another, let me say that I was stirred deeply indeed by an address delivered on May 28 last by the honourable senator from Shelburne (Hon. Mr. Robertson). It was a thoughtful and courageous expression of his views on the economic conditions in Canada at the present time. He made particular reference to the evils of inflation which, as honourable senators will remember, he described as a most baffling and difficult problem. I agree with the honourable senator that it is a difficult problem and, I would add, a very important problem, and one to which the members of the Senate might well give thoughtful study and consideration.

As I understood the honourable senator from Shelburne, he described inflation as an increase in the cost of living and of production, and this condition he proposed to solve, or at least to combat, by decreasing and ultimately abolishing tariff obstructions to international trade. I compliment the honourable senator upon his vigorous thought and the forthright boldness with which he expressed it in this house. Canada is in need of incisive thinking of this kind and of such bold expression of conclusions.

With the proposal that the honourable senator made in that speech, that Canada join the Common Market of the European free trade area, I heartily agree. I also agree that we should progressively remove the tariff barriers that obstruct our trade, and that while we are doing so we should agree not to increase our tariffs.

To that extent I go along completely with the honourable senator, but I would like to add some qualifications. While free trade, in my judgment, would undoubtedly increase our productive power—I am all for it—and would, I believe, have a tendency to cheapen goods, still I would submit that the effect