

referred to a committee today and I am not prepared to proceed, I yield my place on the Order Paper.

**Hon. Eric Cook:** Honourable senators—

**The Hon. the Speaker:** I must inform honourable senators that if the honourable Senator Cook speaks now his speech will have the effect of closing this debate.

**Hon. Mr. Cook:** Honourable senators, we have had a good debate and as a result we are all much better informed on the subject matter before us. We are particularly indebted to Senator Blois, who speaks with the knowledge gained from a lifetime of experience in the textile industry. Whenever Senator Blois speaks he makes a valuable contribution to any debate. Without dealing in detail with his remarks, which are still fresh in our minds, I would say that it is good to remind ourselves of the value of the textile industry during wartime. This point, in my opinion, stresses the fact that it is of great importance to all countries that everything reasonably possible should be done to ensure that all types of industry are encouraged to continue to operate. If our textile industry, or any other industry, ceases to function, we may well see the day when Canada has cause to regret our failure to take the proper steps to keep the industry alive and active.

We are also indebted to Senator Sparrow for his constructive contribution, which I am sure will receive the close consideration of the Government. While I shall make further reference to Senator Sparrow's objections, I would at this point merely say that I welcome his sensible suggestion that it is not necessary that the office of the board be in the national capital region. If the Government does agree with Senator Sparrow, I would strongly urge upon the minister the fact that there are vast areas of suitable real estate in my Province of Newfoundland and Labrador which may be acquired at a very reasonable price, and upon which a desirable headquarters for the board may be erected.

Honourable senators, this bill seeks to assist in the solving of a national problem. Unfortunately, this is an area where the Government is damned if it acts, and damned if it does not. Those who support all measures that will encourage free and freer trade will be troubled by the bill, while those who argue for a reasonable degree of protection will welcome it.

This bill is, of course, enabling legislation. Before any action may be taken, each case must be thoroughly examined on its own merits. After all interested parties have been heard and the tribunal reports that in its considered judgment sound reasons exist which warrant action, then and only then will the Government decide what should and will be done. In so deciding the Government will also give serious consideration to, and review the five aspects of, the problem to which I referred when introducing the bill. To refresh your memories, these five aspects are:

(1) Canada's international obligations; (2) The interests of our own consumers; (3) The employment factor; (4)

The conditions prevailing in international trade; and (5) Action will only be taken to assist lines of production which can and will in due course become viable.

Therefore, to those who worry because they fear Canada has turned away from the desirable objective of encouraging freer trade between all nations, I say that the walls of Jericho have not yet fallen. Canada's trade policies have not changed. To support this statement I refer to a release issued yesterday. The release deals with the speech of the minister delivered to 300 German financial, business and industrial leaders at a luncheon in Bonn on Monday, April 19, 1971, which reads:

Mr. Pepin said Canadian prosperity is very much dependent on a liberal international trading environment. He said: "This fact is reflected in our trade policies. We are obstinate proponents of freer trade on a multilateral basis."

In view of this very clear statement of the Government's policy no doubt many of the fears of Senator Sparrow, and of the many others who do not welcome the bill, will be set at rest. This bill does not mean we have abandoned the goal of freer trade. I have quoted the minister's recent statement to that effect. It does mean, however, that suitable steps will be taken and reasonable guidelines established to prevent our own markets from being unfairly and improperly exploited. The only result of such exploitation is that Canadian capital will be lost, industries that may be urgently needed in times of emergency will disappear and, most important of all, tens of thousands of Canadian men and women will not obtain gainful employment. To prevent these things happening, the Government must act, and this bill will give the Government the necessary power to act. If the Government does not use these powers wisely and well, then Parliament can intervene, and in the final result the voters of Canada will have the last word.

If the bill receives second reading, I shall move that it be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. At the committee's hearings I understand that the minister and representatives of the department will be available to answer the numerous questions that have been touched on during this debate.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

#### REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On motion of Hon. Mr. Cook, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

#### JURY DUTY

#### INELIGIBILITY OF QUEBEC AND NEWFOUNDLAND WOMEN—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the honourable Senator Casgrain calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the Provinces of Quebec and Newfoundland women are not called for jury duty.—(Honourable Senator Martin, P.C.).