

listening. In it we find the promise of legislation which translates into being the goal of a just society set by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he was chosen to lead the government two and a half years ago.

No one expected that members of the opposition would agree it was a good speech. According to them, it was an empty effort. Let us examine the emptiness of the declarations contained in it: the promise to provide adequate protection to Canadian consumers as a result of unfair trade practices; the planned provisions dealing with pollution, and the widening of the benefits of unemployment insurance; the revision of labour management relations and new labour standards for industries within federal jurisdiction; programs to establish national marketing boards to improve market potential for agricultural products; and the reorganization of the department concerned with environment about which the Prime Minister already acted today by appointing one of the ministers responsible for housing to be also in charge of this new department.

● (4:20 p.m.)

White papers will be presented to Parliament on income security, national defence, communications, citizenship and immigration. The value of these white papers cannot be underestimated. They are vehicles designed to involve interested Canadians in every walk of life in government policies, examples of which are the white papers on veterans affairs, tax reform, and the unemployment insurance. The tremendous response of the people to all of these has contributed to the decisions made and those yet to be made.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this an indication of emptiness? Does this Throne Speech, as implied by members opposite hard pressed to find fault with it, fail to offer hope for the enactment of measures that would stimulate the economy, reduce unemployment, etc.? Within the limit of my time in this debate, I shall attempt to discuss a few subjects which I hope will be of interest to hon. members.

For some time now, I have noted disturbing trends such as an economic nationalism and a heavily disguised anti-Americanism in this country which, while not widespread, is nevertheless to be deplored by responsible Canadians. I regret that the Leader of the New Democratic Party—for whom I have great respect and to whom I wish to extend my congratulations as he celebrates today 35 years in public life, and may he enjoy many more years of active service—never misses an opportunity to blame the Americans for all the ills of the world. His special target is American investment in Canadian industries. He seems to harbour a pet hate against the United States, and he has recently demonstrated this attitude by criticizing the government for the sale of natural gas to our neighbour to the south, a sale which would bring \$2 billion to Canada in the next few years.

I wonder if it has ever occurred to him and to his followers that friendly co-operation with the United States is a sure way to stimulate growth and bring

prosperity to Canadians. Canada needs a great deal of investment capital to provide opportunities for expansion and a higher rate of employment.

Those who are indulging in the barren role of anti-Americanism would have the government withhold industrial incentive subsidies from U.S. companies which want to invest in underdeveloped regions of Canada. I congratulate the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) for treating equally all industrial concerns that can qualify under the act, regardless of whether they are Canadian, American, or of any other nationality. The unemployed certainly do not worry about who owns the shares and who will collect the dividends, if and when they are paid. They are simply concerned with a greater number of jobs in their community, bigger payrolls and more people to pay taxes for expanding municipal services.

Premier Bourassa of Quebec was in New York recently for the purpose of soliciting U.S. investors to put some of their money into his province. His major concern was to increase American investment in his province to finance a hydro electric development, for which he needs \$2 billion. This development would ensure adequate supplies of electricity for Quebec, with a surplus being left available to help supply some eastern parts of the United States. I hope that he will convince the U.S. investors to accept his proposal which, in the end, would be in the interest of both countries.

While I am on this subject, I wish to quote an editorial which appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* of May 5, 1970. It reads as follows:

The following basic premise is too often forgotten by the shriller anti-American voices:

One fact of life that must be recognized is that Canada, if it continues to exist, will do so by suffrance of the United States. We shall continue as always to depend upon the United States forbearance. If the Americans turned ruthless, they could extinguish us. They are unlikely to do so by old fashioned military methods or positive economic sanctions, but by ceasing to take our economic interest into consideration they could make life for us as Canadians on our part of the continent unacceptable.

Canadians may not like this "fact of life"; indeed, the resentment of it is one cause of anti-American attitude. But wishing will not change anything. Since the fact of life is inescapable, wise Canadian policy starts with the need to maintain, as Holmes says, "the basic goodwill of the Americans and their government".

None of this is to say that we must support everything the U.S. does. But it does suggest an examination, an analysis, an enlightened arguing rather than the shrill response of the last few days to the Cambodian adventure. It does suggest that the CBC might not cater principally to the critics of United States policies; and it does suggest that the Commons might more usefully debate a matter after thinking about it rather than in the hot flush and confusion of surprise.

On June 13, 1970, the *Times Journal* of Thunder Bay, in my own constituency, had an editorial expressing similar sentiments on the subject. I wish to quote three short paragraphs from it as follows:

Radio and television documentaries, editorialized newscasts and commentary programs being what they are, provide an ideal forum for anti-Americans, despite the fact they constitute a small minority of Canadians.