

present some surprising contrasts to the situation which obtained when I was summoned to the Senate and took my place in mid-May of 1972, shortly before dissolution. Undoubtedly, we—and particularly those in the other place—face interesting months ahead. It seems to me that the people of Canada expect, and are entitled to expect, Parliament and its members, both here and in the other place, to put the best interests of Canada and its people ahead of all other considerations. I am sure that this will be our aim.

Turning to the Speech which His Excellency addressed to us on Thursday last, I am pleased to note, first of all, the references to Canada's international involvements. On the political side, it is true that Canada may not during the sixties have exercised the same influence on world affairs and in the councils of the nations as we did in the late forties and the fifties. The circumstances are understandable. Canada's unusually strong position following the end of World War II probably could not be sustained by a country of only 20 million people, but I submit that Canada still has important and highly significant roles to play in the world of international politics, and I welcome the declared interest of our government in stating that it intends to pursue Canada's role with vigour in this area.

In so far as Canada's participation as one of the great trading nations of the world is concerned, I am sure that we are all glad that Canada plays its part in such outstanding international organizations as those dealing with the international monetary system, so important to every trading nation and particularly to a trading nation like our own, living as the neighbour to the the most powerful nation in the free world and perhaps in the whole world today. I am pleased that the Government of Canada now has adopted such a concerned attitude towards the European Common Market. We shall all await with interest the discussions that take place to determine, during the months and years ahead, exactly how this will affect Canada, and how Canada can manage its position in relation to the European Common Market to its own best interests and, hopefully, to the mutual advantage of all those concerned.

Nevertheless, whenever we start discussing Canada's involvement with other nations, we always come to a consideration of Canada's relationship with the United States of America. Here of course there are many complex problems. We boast about the friendly relationships between our two countries. At the same time, a good deal of suspicion of American domination of our economy, and sometimes of our culture, is bound to be foremost in the minds of Canadians.

Of course, to persons from my part of Canada, the action, or the proposed action, of the Government of the United States, in imposing a 6.6 per cent ad valorem duty on Michelin tires made in Nova Scotia, is a matter of great concern. I hope that the government of this country will discuss vigorously with our American friends the rationale of this move and the necessity for its continuance, because it may be very important indeed to an industry providing a livelihood to a great many people and a real stimulus to the economy of the province from which I come.

[Hon. Mr. Hicks.]

May I suggest that we should deal with the United States in an atmosphere of friendliness, but also in an atmosphere of firmness. We should never forget, in our dealings with the United States, that she needs many of our products and many of our resources—our water resources, our electric power, our gas and oil resources, to mention but a few—and the United States should not be allowed, in the long or even the medium term of time, to have access to those resources on her own terms while at the same time discriminating unfairly against any aspect of the Canadian economy, and particularly discriminating against secondary industry in Canada.

I hope, therefore, that the references in His Excellency's Speech really do presage vigorous action, informed and firm negotiations, on the part of the Government of Canada in dealing with our great neighbour to the south.

Most of the Speech, however, deals with domestic problems and it seems to me that the key to His Excellency's Speech this year is to be found in the paragraph which reads:

At home, the Government remains fully committed to two pre-eminent goals, national unity and equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

In pursuit of these goals, the Government assigns the highest priority to two policy areas:

—economic policy, to reduce unemployment, contain inflation and strengthen the economy generally

—social policy, to bring about, in consultation with the Provinces, a re-organization of existing social security programs.

National unity is, of course, of concern to every Canadian, to every member of this Parliament, both in the other place and here. That must be so, because surely if this Parliament does not stand for one nation indivisible, how can we expect the nation to stand? Here I feel constrained to say that I am concerned about the lack of assistance which in this country is given to the idea and image of national unity by the press and the media generally.

I remember very well what a friend of mine, a distinguished professor at the University of Toronto, said at the time of the last visit of the Queen to the City of Quebec. You may remember, honourable senators, it had been rumoured that nasty incidents would take place. In fact no such incidents took place, except those which some press members deliberately tried to stir up in order to make their own stories. At that time my friend, the Toronto professor, said, "It almost seems that the press and other media of this country have a death wish for the nation."

• (2040)

I am one of those who believe, with every fibre of their being, in the freedom of the press and the freedom of expression. I do not think that there is much point in censorship by law, because it is very difficult to enforce and almost always does more harm than good. But I do think that the freedom of the press and freedom of the mass media must be coupled with a correlative sense of responsibility. While I would defend the right of individual newspapers to take any view they like—even to taking and expounding views which might be divisive in the country, in so far as they do not transgress the laws of