

I think the problem is that there are so many departments in this government that one department does not know what the other is doing. A prime example of this is, at a time when a major industry is in trouble through lack of markets, either domestically or internationally, the Minister of Regional Economic Affairs (Mr. Marchand) is allocating money to establish the same type of productive capacity as that which is in trouble. This does not make any sense. Is it not time we embarked on a program to find out what we could do best to compete in the various parts of the world. We should concentrate on these particular objectives, instead of muddling along in the same old manner that was outdated years ago. Certainly, we should learn. If we cannot learn and if we have lost all initiative, then we can copy.

I point to the economic status today of West Germany, which not only has no unemployment problem but has a problem obtaining sufficient workers. We should look to Japan whose industries were smashed during the war some 30 years ago and who today is an industrial giant. Here we are in Canada talking about going to the United States on our knees and asking for concessions. Where is the leadership? Many of us in this House, especially from Ontario, have grown up next door to the United States. Many of us have been engaged in businesses directly concerned with companies in the United States. I am not afraid of United States domination. I am not afraid of a take-over by the United States. That is not what they want. These are businessmen. All they ask is that their counterparts in Canada be businessmen, too, and speak to them as one businessman to another. They do not want Canadians to go to them with cup-in-hand and say "please". They want the co-operation that is their due as one neighbour to another. Is this too much to expect?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my adrenal glands do not seem to be pumping very hard today. I am more in the mood in which the House was yesterday, I suppose, when I found myself very frequently applauding individual statements made by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and others, because I think there were some profound truths spoken about Canadian-American relations. But there seemed really to be more agreement among speakers than disagreement. I wondered for a time if I might see a repetition of something that happened a good many years ago in British Columbia. There was a young judge in the Kootenays named Cox. He visited his circuits only occasionally, and in the district of Boundary it was usually eight months before the judge arrived. At one time the inhabitants of this mining area saved up quite a splendid collection of law suits with which to test the young judge. But his horse went lame on the Kootenay trail and the judge did not arrive on time, so the litigants repaired to the local saloon. Judge Cox was a long time getting there, so they stayed in the saloon three days. At the end of that time all the litigation had been settled among themselves and there were no cases left for the judge to hear. They were strong men in the Kootenays and continue to be so. I will refrain

Economic Relations with United States

from speaking about Coast-Chilcotin this afternoon because it would take too long.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: I thought yesterday that perhaps sometime this afternoon the opposition party would decide it was not really worthwhile to bring their resolution to a vote today, but after hearing them today I think perhaps they feel it should come to a vote.

I have had some trouble with the resolution, as have many others. I have looked at it sideways, straight-up, upside down, and I have held it up to a strong light, but I really cannot be sure what the official opposition party is trying to say here. The closest I can paraphrase this statement is that we must stand up to the Americans but we must never tell them anything that they might not care to hear.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: I am afraid we cannot have it both ways. I am quite convinced that neither our American friends nor any other friendly nation on this earth would want us to do that. The United States does not expect that Canadian policy should be identical with theirs on every issue. We may find such complete harmony of views among the governments of eastern Europe, but not within free and independent societies such as ours, and to suggest that our American friends really expect Canada's views to be identical with the American in every aspect is to insult the intelligence of the American government and of the American diplomats. What the United States does have a right to expect of us is that our position be clear, and that we speak as frankly and calmly about the few areas of disagreement as we do about those vast regions of bilateral and multilateral relationships in which the two governments have worked in complete harmony for many years, and in which they will continue to work in such harmony.

I suggest that in dealing with other states we must have policies which have the immense virtue of credibility. I should like to quote the diplomat Talleyrand. This is a partial quote from a long statement, but I think it is appropriate here. This is what he said:

In order to destroy a prejudice fairly generally current, I must here point out that diplomacy is in no way a science of cunning and duplicity. If good faith is necessary anywhere, it is especially so in political transactions, for it is good faith that makes them strong and enduring—

In respect of credibility, we might cast our thoughts back to the disagreement between the United States and Canada over the Bomarc missiles. I am sure I do not have to remind members of the Official Opposition about that issue because they were in government then. This was a situation in which Canada accepted the Bomarc delivery vehicles and then said that we did not want to put war-heads on them. It would be hard to imagine a less credible policy than that one. It can only be compared to a man who walks into a shoe store, buys a pair of shoes and announces he will only wear one of them. It is such lack of credibility, such unreliability in dealings abroad, that arouse the contempt, anger or scorn of other governments, and who could blame them?

Let us compare this with the recent China vote in the United Nations in which Canada and the United States