

Commonwealth Caribbean

between a strong and viable policy or a healthy economy and a depressed one.

We know that in our external contacts we have often made grave errors because we really did not understand the people with whom we were dealing. We did not know their customs. So much valuable time was lost and so much strength was wasted. However, we do know the people of the Commonwealth Caribbean, and they know us. We have had a long history of friendly ties with them. Even before we had the capacity to deal with foreign affairs, which I would place at around 1917 under the great Sir Robert Borden's leadership, we were developing contacts with the external world, and these were with the Commonwealth Caribbean. Interesting and valuable trade negotiations were carried out in Ottawa on more than one occasion.

To the historic ties we add the geographic propinquity. They are in fact in this global world, as it is still called, our neighbour. Perhaps more impressive than anything else—and here I show my bias as a parliamentarian—these communities have parliamentary institutions which are strong and which are in some cases carried out under very great difficulty, the highest goals for which parliamentary institutions are established.

● (1612)

I do not get too carried away by the views of those who say we should apply some litmus test to every country in the world and, if we do not approve of them morally, 100 per cent, we should have nothing to do with them. Because we draw our inheritance in a parliamentary way from the United Kingdom as do they, I believe this establishes a bond of extreme importance and immense value. They are sister members of the Commonwealth; they are neighbours, and it is heartening to see that in some of the islands in the Commonwealth Caribbean where the institutions are very small, they are able to carry on well and to develop a party system and all the institutions known to the British pattern.

They know us and they still like us. That is important, Mr. Speaker. Canadians from the private sector and the public sector have been going there for many years. I should like to see this bond strengthened along the lines I have suggested.

Over the years I have moved away from advising aid and toward developing a mutuality of interest and stimulating trade between our countries. That is why I asked for better ports in the east, better facilities for shipping and exchange programs for students, professionals, social workers, politicians and so on. I believe this is the positive way for us to help them and, in the long run, for us to help each other. I think there are great possibilities in this, and I should like to see the matter studied very carefully.

I suggest this proposal should be examined by a joint committee. I propose a joint committee because the Senate of Canada has established an excellent reputation for the quality of investigation of its committees. In my judgment its methods are better than ours, its procedures much more effective, and its accomplishments generally far more substantial. In 1970 a

Senate committee made an exhaustive and interesting study of the Commonwealth Caribbean which added much to our deliberations.

I could say much more, Mr. Speaker, but I have spoken on this subject before. Knowing how hon. members hang on my every word in every session, I shall not repeat what I have said. Exactly one year ago on the Friday before the Christmas recess—I seem to be fortunate enough to get the opportunity to speak on a Friday—I remember speaking to hon. members in a parliamentary way. I again invite members who enjoy the fruit of the cane and the Caribbean high commissioners in the gallery to join me, after the debate is over and approval has been given by the House, in a little Christmas cheer à la Caribbean rum.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marke Raines (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) that I wish him all the best when he retires from this House after his career as a parliamentarian.

I was somewhat surprised that when he resumed his seat he was applauded by members of his party. While I respect the hon. member, I am completely and diametrically opposed to his ideas. During the four and one-half years I have been a member of this House, I have wanted other people from British Columbia to travel to his beautiful part of the world, to Ontario, and to Quebec. I want massive student exchanges. I must tell the hon. member what we have in British Columbia and why I cannot in any way support his plea for exchanges with the Caribbean.

The economy class air fare from Vancouver to Ottawa and return costs \$430. It costs more to Montreal, and far more to go to the hon. member's province. For four and one-half years I have been urging this government, the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) and everyone else, to provide lower air fares to lure British Columbians to other parts of Canada. So far we have seen just a small drop in fares and the introduction of some charter fares. Many British Columbians still have not seen Prince Edward Island, they have not seen Ontario or Quebec. For half the fare they can travel to Hawaii, San Francisco and Seattle, and people in eastern Canada can take their holidays in the Bahamas and the Caribbean. They can have student and teacher exchanges between Canada and France or, as the hon. member wishes, between Canada and the Caribbean, which are supported by the federal government, while we do not have enough funds to support this country. At this time in our history I want people from the west to see the east, and vice versa.

I propose that every Canadian from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island should have the right to travel to other parts of the country once a year for a fare of \$100 or \$150, to put an arbitrary figure on it. People from British Columbia could visit Quebec city, Montreal, Prince Edward Island, and people from those areas could visit British Columbia. In this way all would have a better understanding of the country. As a