

Senator Cameron: He did not say that; I did. However, there was something that intrigued me about the discussion of the relationships. He emphasized the importance of the distinctness, and I think this is a very critical element in the relationship between the two countries. No one, certainly on this side of the line, has any hesitancy in agreeing that we must have closer relations with the United States. My question to you is: To what extent is this distinctness recognized in the United States? Because this is crucial to many other relationships.

Mr. Diebold: It is very difficult indeed to generalize about United States awareness of Canadian things. There are three kinds. There is unawareness; there is the sort of generalized awareness that Canada is there and it has certain manifestations; and then there is the somewhat more refined kind of awareness that some people have.

There is no doubt in the world that anyone who addresses himself to the problems of Canada or to relations between the two countries understands not only that there is a distinctness but that it is very important, that there should be one. There could not be a healthy relationship between the United States and Canada if Canadians did not feel this. Therefore Americans, to be aware of this relationship, must feel it.

That is why I thought it a good term. I really do not know anyone who does not want it that way and who does not understand that it is very important to the whole relationship. It is only then that you get to the question of what distinctness means—or requires—in any given set of circumstances. In other words, does distinctness have something to do with free trade or television? Of course it does, but it does not point to any single or clear-cut policy.

I do not like a lot of the blotting-out effects that take place in mass publications, television and radio, the blurring of differences, the standardization. I do not like it when that causes different regions of the United States or parts of the world to lose their special character.

But that sort of thing is not, if I may say so, best dealt with by legislation. Culture is people themselves. I think you import culture more than you export it, and if Canadians have problems they are your own problems, but they are my problems too as one who watches, likes, visits and enjoys Canada. I like distinctness because I think it makes the world a more vivid and interesting place.

To go back to your first question, I guess I would be willing to generalize to the point of saying that more people this year than 20 years ago are conscious of Canada as a distinct entity, that it is there, and will be. I do not think that is the worry.

Senator Cameron: So far as Canada is concerned, we are conscious of the impact of the non-governmental organizations in shaping government policy, but what is a matter of concern is that non-governmental agencies in the United States are having the same effect in shaping American government policy vis-à-vis Canada.

Senator Connolly: Might I ask Senator Cameron if he would elaborate on that? Is he talking, for example, about the banking institutions authorizing loans in Canada and supplying capital?

Senator Cameron: No. I am thinking of the whole climate of the relationship between the two countries, and

the acceptability that governments will come to as a result of feeling that people are concerned. In Canada, particularly, we have this whole question of biculturalism and multiculturalism, which is different from yours. There is no question that it is shaping a lot of our attitudes, vis-à-vis other countries and particularly the United States.

Senator Rowe: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear Senator Cameron's statement prior to the last one. Did Senator Cameron say—I ask this question purely for information—that Canada must have closer ties with the United States?

Senator Cameron: I did not say that we must, but that I think we will. It comes out of this greater understanding, particularly at the non-governmental level.

The Deputy Chairman: Perhaps we might come back to the main question. As I understand it, you asked: What is the comparison between the influence of non-governmental persons and institutions in Canada and the United States?

Mr. Diebold: I can only speak of the influence of American non-governmental bodies on Washington. We must distinguish between such non-governmental institutions as *Time* and the *Reader's Digest* on the one hand, and such non-governmental institutions as the Council on Foreign Relations or the Centre for Canadian Studies at Johns Hopkins on the other. I do not know what influence the latter two have. There is a record of the influence of the first two.

I think this is the kind of issue that is subject to change as the relations of the economies change. Naturally, all of the U.S. business interests which feel they have some problems in Canada on which they are making no headway will try to exercise some influence in Washington. That is the result of having national governments and international business. Yet there are exceptions to my statement. I know a good many businessmen who take the position that they can do better by themselves than with government help, not just in relation to their interests in Canada but to their affairs all over the world. They feel that if they rely too much on Washington they will be caught up in disputes which are not really of their making or be let down when Washington wants to avoid trouble. That view exists side-by-side with the view of a good many American businessmen that the American government does too little for American business interests abroad compared to, say, what is done by the Governments of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, or for that matter, Canada. So there are contrary forces at work. There are quite a number of American businessmen who feel they should come to terms with the Canadian government on their own. However, there are issues at times on which they will try to get help from Washington.

I suggested earlier that in my opinion it will not be considered automatic that government support should be given for everything. There will be doubts, particularly in as intimate a relation as ours, as to whether things ought to be achieved on the level of government to government. I do not think I can go any further on that point, Mr. Chairman. It is not something that is easy