

would be better off if they were in the importing business in a country such as Russia, because they would know exactly what goods they could import and what goods they could not import. Within Canada, after this bill passes, they stated they would not know with any certainty what goods they could or could not import. They say this bill would give the textile board the power to convince the minister that importation embargos should be placed on the importation of any goods which under section 8 could be said to be injurious to Canadian manufacturing industry.

● (9:30 p.m.)

From reading the committee proceedings one could convince oneself about the length of time for which goods could be curtailed from importation. In *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence* No. 15 the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) asked a number of questions about the meaning of the word "duration". On the same page the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Howard) said that the policy is not to spell out a specific period of time and that clause 18 (d) deals with prospects for the industry to become internationally competitive. We return to the argument I made this afternoon which has not been disputed by the minister or by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary. At this point the chairman interjected and asked whether the question was in respect of clause 17 (3) and the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin said:

It is clause 17(3) that I am questioning on, Mr. Chairman. The word "duration" is there: "the board... shall specify the recommended scope and duration."

I shall omit a few words of the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary which are inconsequential at this point. Then Mr. Drahotsky, general director, office of industrial policy, stated:

The intention, really, is to leave this to the discretion of the board. In some instances, it might indeed specify a definite period; in other cases, it may simply recommend that the situation be reviewed from time to time.

These are the words I want to emphasize—that the situation may be revised from time to time. In other words, if a person feels he is being injured under clause 8, of this bill he may file a complaint and a board of inquiry could be held which might recommend to the minister that importation of a commodity be cut off until the inquiry was completed or until the injurious effect of the importation had in fact ended. Mr. Drahotsky at page 8 states that it may simply recommend that the situation be reviewed from time to time.

We have seen governments which have the ability to stall the most normal things from time to time, but here we have a situation in which an importer may have a number of dollars worth of imported goods on the high seas or he may have made a purchase in a foreign country; the importer need not be notified, under clause 8, that the board has received a complaint which has been filed in respect of the importation of those goods. Then suddenly the importer learns that his goods will not be allowed into Canada, he is out "X" number of

Textile and Clothing Board Act

dollars and Canadians will be deprived of whatever it was that the importer thought he could sell on this market.

My amendment specifically asks for a democratic right in a democratic country. If the government is about to take action in respect of a specific imported commodity, the importer should be notified and have an opportunity to present evidence. We have the Bill of Rights which spells out that no man shall be judged without having his day in court. This bill, however, in essence provides that an importer may be tried without being notified.

Mr. Pepin: Read clause 12. It is all there.

Mr. Horner: The minister suggests that I read clause 12. I suggest that the minister read committee proceedings No. 19. He was not present at those hearings. At those hearings the importers clearly stated there is no provision in the bill that the board would have to notify the importer that his goods were subject to an inquiry because they were considered to be injurious to the products of an established company producing similar or like goods.

Mr. Pepin: Answers were provided.

Mr. Horner: The minister says answers were provided. I would inform him that when I attended the meetings of the committee on that particular occasion the answers were not provided to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of the importers. The minister refers to clause 12, but that clause does not specifically apply in this case. It applies only once the decision is made by the board.

Mr. Pepin: No.

Mr. Horner: The minister says no.

Mr. Pepin: The decision to hold.

Mr. Horner: I have listened patiently to the minister. Clause 12 specifically spells out that the board may in a manner specified by its rules receive evidence submitted to it by interested parties. It does not say the board shall notify the interested parties and that the interested parties shall have the opportunity to submit evidence whenever a complaint is made against the importation of a particular product. If the minister would like me to move an amendment—

● (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: Oh, no.

Mr. Horner: —or if I could have the unanimous consent of the House, I would move an amendment that under clause 12 "may" be changed to "shall", so that it would read, "the board shall, in the manner specified by its rules" receive evidence. The minister nods his head in approval of the suggestion I am making. I appreciate his acknowledgement of the point I am making. The amendment which I am proposing is that the board, on receiving notice of a complaint, shall notify the person or persons involved in the importation of the textile and clothing goods. Knowing now, as I do, the full import of