

ritorial claims, foreign ownership, cultural distinction, or energy and resource management.

This is all very interesting philosophy, but I submit it indicates no resolve and certainly no sense of urgency on the part of the Canadian Government to develop mutually acceptable positions on matters of concern to either or both nations. The White Paper goes on to advance the theory that Canadian foreign policy primarily should be an extension of domestic objectives, and I quote:

In undertaking this review the Government has been constantly reminded of its need and responsibility to choose carefully aims, objectives and priorities in sufficiently long and broad terms to ensure that essential Canadian interests and values are safeguarded in a world situation where rapid and even radical changes can be anticipated as normal rather than exceptional conditions. Canada, like other states, must act according to how it perceives its aims and interest. External activities should be directly related to national policies pursued within Canada and serve the same objectives.

In essence, foreign policy is a product of the Government's progressive definition and pursuit of national aims and interests in the international environment. It is the extension abroad of national policies.

In my opinion this is fallacious reasoning. The domestic policy of any nation is developed and implemented within the perimeter of its sovereign right to manage its internal affairs as it decides. When it comes to relations with other nations, this right and the power to implement it no longer prevails. For this reason international relations must of necessity start with a recognition of each nation's right to its own domestic positions and proceed from that point to develop international policies and agreements acceptable to both because they are reasonable and mutually advantageous. Such international arrangements rarely, if ever, can be the mere extension of one nation's domestic policy into the international field.

A second and more serious concern is the emotional brand of negative nationalism that is being fostered in this country today by federal spokesmen and by significant sections of the nation's news media.

Let my remarks on this subject not be misunderstood. I am intensely proud of being a Canadian. With millions of other Canadians I want to see Canada preserved and respected and developed as a strong and independent sovereign nation. I do not favour and would vigorously oppose any form of political union with the United States. I say this, not because of any anti-American sentiments but because many of the goals and aspirations of Americans and Canadians differ significantly. For this reason the divergent goals and aspirations of the citizens of each nation can best be realized by their remaining separate sovereign entities. This position, which I submit is in the best interests of both nations, is in no way incompatible with close international co-operation in matters of mutual interest and concern.

[Hon. Mr. Manning.]

It is disturbing to see this desirable co-operation being prejudiced, and in some cases sabotaged, by those who seize every opportunity to create the false impression that the United States is an international villain with calculated and sinister designs on Canada's independence as a nation. The emotional brand of negative nationalism which is now becoming evident in Canada is largely a backlash generated by this false but widely held impression. Too many Canadian politicians and news commentators seem incapable of discussing Canadian sovereignty except in a context of anti-American sentiment.

America's unquestioned impact on Canada's economy and culture and way of life is not the result of some sinister United States design to interfere in Canadian affairs. It is the natural and inevitable consequence of a young nation with limited human and financial and technological resources living next door to a major industrial and financial and military world power. Because this is so, no amount of vocal sabre rattling about Canada's sovereignty and national identity will have any meaningful effect on the social, economic and financial impacts which invariably stem from our close proximity to a highly developed nation of over 200 million people. The sooner this fact of life is recognized the better, for perhaps we will then stop fighting windmills and concentrate on developing realistic Canada-United States relations which will best serve our mutual interests and enhance the ability of each country to attain its own domestic goals.

May I comment on two or three areas of common concern in which efforts should be made to arrive at mutually acceptable agreements as quickly as possible.

One of these, mentioned in Mr. Sharp's White Paper on Canadian Foreign Policy, is the matter of hemispheric security and defence. Surely this is an area in which an intelligent decision can be reached as to what properly should be the responsibility and role of each nation. Two facts are obvious. One is that the United States in its own interests must of necessity be prepared to repel any attack that might be lodged against any region of North America. The other is that Canada lacks the military resources to defend its thousands of miles of coastline against any major military aggressor. This is something that should be kept in mind by Canadian spokesmen when they are vigorously asserting Canada's sovereignty over Arctic waters.

What we presently possess in the Arctic is paper sovereignty. Suppose for the sake of argument the Soviet war fleet moved into Canada's Arctic waters, precisely what would or could Canada do? It would be no defence to quote the federal statute under which we affirm our sovereignty, or to tell the commander of the Russian fleet that the Arctic waters are ours because the royal family visited the region and our Prime Minister spent a night in an Eskimo igloo. In any real confrontation, paper sovereignty becomes meaningless unless it can be backed up by the physical resources and power necessary to enforce statutory claims to ownership and control. Canada does not possess this military strength, and for this reason if any powerful aggressor ever seriously