

*Economic Relations with United States*

charter member of the League, and in large measure this country was the creator of the modern Commonwealth of Nations.

We have been activists in multitudinous international bodies and we do have a concern for the wider world. But for a host of reasons, some voluntary and some involuntary, our relations with the United States are the most vital, the most absorbing and of greatest concern and interest to all Canadian citizens. Indeed, it might be said that 90 per cent of our foreign policy concerns our relations with the United States and the conduct of those relations. If we have today reached the stage where Canada-United States relations are in confusion, disarray or in jeopardy, we are, Sir, at a very grave situation.

It is, I fear, painfully apparent that we are at such an unwelcome and potentially hurtful phase. Any government that presides over the deterioration of Canada-United States relations bears a fearful and awful responsibility before the Canadian people, because the fallout of such deterioration could penetrate and injure every nook and cranny of our economic structure. Let us, therefore, not minimize the seriousness and the gravity of the matter placed before us by this motion today.

I would be less than candid if I suggested that the government of Canada was solely responsible for the unhappy situation now prevailing. But I would be myopic and irresponsible in my role as a parliamentarian if I did not try to analyse the contributions that have been made, willingly or unwillingly, wittingly or perhaps unwittingly, by the government of this country to the decline in our once close relationship with our southern neighbour.

Nor should any of us, regardless of party, pretend that there has not been a decline, that communications are as they used to be or as they should be. It would be naïve, regrettably naïve, perhaps dangerously naïve, to suggest that all is well. So it is the purpose of this debate to examine the conduct of Canadian foreign policy in relationship to the United States to see wherein errors and miscalculations have been made, and hopefully to find avenues for more useful, practical exploration and operation.

In the last few months there have been developments in the broader world in which Canada has played a part and some to which we have been merely a witness. There have been momentous and interesting developments. There have been alterations, at least, in the postures of the great powers, and there has been a great change in the complexion and composition of the United Nations. Sometimes, perhaps in response to some of these larger moves and developments, the government of Canada has adopted postures, has taken positions, or has followed courses of action which have been unhelpful to its essential association with the United States.

I think, Sir, at a time of such great sensitivity as this, and on a matter of such fundamental importance, that we must all be especially alert, particularly careful in our utterances, in our evaluations, in our judgments and in our appreciations. Diplomacy, like domestic politics, is anything but a static thing. It is not bound and shackled by the narrow confines or the brittle rigidities of the past. Changes, new developments, new emphases and new priorities emerge and must be tested and evaluated. I am

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

unsympathetic—and here I speak euphemistically—with those who would seek to bind us forever in the pessimistic and rigid postures of the cold war. The tough doctrines of the Dulles era doubtless played their part and served their purposes, and we may indeed owe much of our present existence to their efficacy. But they may not serve us well in today's realities. President Truman in his time was one of the world's greatest statesmen, but these times are not his times.

I welcome the opening out of relations and the broadening of contacts between the United States and the People's Republic of China, and between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I believe that President Nixon has shown statesmanship and realism in his decisions to move into a new era of closer contact and, perhaps—who knows?—closer understandings between his country and the vast nation ruled by the men at Peking. I hope that his visit to that country will be useful and valuable. I think that efforts to scale the great walls of separation and misunderstanding are all to the good.

I was particularly happy that the leader of my party was one of the first western statesmen to visit China in the new era of acceptance by that country of people and leaders from our part of the world. While at the time I expressed criticism of the utterances of the Prime Minister of Canada in the Soviet Union—and I still regard those utterances as unwise, unhelpful and improper—I nevertheless believe that contacts between our two countries and visits by the people of our two countries should be encouraged, and hopefully will be productive of a degree of common good. We would all welcome that.

The recent weeks have been interesting. We have seen a renaissance of summitry. This is not to be scorned, it is to be welcomed. Indeed, we almost see before us in the world a sort of mobile or perambulatory Congress of Vienna as statesmen from all over the world make visits, though none of us believe, as we would not believe about earlier activities, that all is altruism and that the old norms of realpolitik have been discarded as the leaders of the great powers move about on the world's stage and engage in competition for acceptance. The only danger, as I see it, in summitry is when summitry is accompanied by naïveté, and some of us are old enough to remember the tragic and inane example of this when that pathetic figure, Neville Chamberlain, was for an unhappy and tragic space of time one of the leaders of the western world. In his complete acceptance of what he was told, he apparently lost the capacity to evaluate what he should have seen.

• (3:20 p.m.)

In the current summitry among the great power leaders, I believe we can count upon a general and useful realism. While advances may be made in understanding, while gains may be achieved in accommodation, there will be no forgetfulness of such hard realities as Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the Berlin wall, naval penetration in the Mediterranean, Tibet, Korea, or the Bay of Pigs and many other crude emanations of power politics on the international scene. Indeed, it is well that among great powers today there is a degree of realism. In that realism there may be for some of us much less powerful, much less important, a not inconsiderable hope, if not an option of security.