

*Report on Canada-U.S. Meeting*

States to discuss problems of mutual concern. That is the kind of discussion that in itself certainly ought to be useful.

It is really quite difficult to tell from the communiqué or from what the minister has said what real progress had been made toward the solution of the matters that were discussed. For example, the annex refers to the position of the United States, that the world payments equilibrium would require the United States to rebuild a substantial surplus concurrent account, and that this would entail adjustments in the pattern of world payments.

This is a very obscure statement that might very well give some cause for alarm, if anybody could figure out exactly what it means; but clearly all the annex does is indicate substantial conflict of position as between the United States and the world at large, including Canada, in this regard.

Canada's statement of its position as to its long term objective of greater balance in its over-all current account, which would reduce Canada's dependance on net inflows of capital, indicates nothing at all as to what progress if any was made to reconcile these apparently very conflicting positions.

They apparently talked about the operation of the international monetary system and the annex is very obscure with regard to this. It is not clear, for example, whether the ministers representing the two countries are happy with the arrangements that have been made to provide for stability, such as special drawing rights, or whether in fact there is concern as to what is likely to develop, and whether the ministers from the two countries formulated any approach to these problems.

The United States members apparently noted with satisfaction the fact that Canada has accelerated its Kennedy Round tariff reductions by putting them into effect immediately, and that Canada is liberalizing its tourist allowances. The United States should note that with satisfaction.

With regard to some matters of very intense concern to Canadians at the present time, there is very little that is of a concrete nature. The ministerial committee apparently reviewed the grain situation and "the two governments agreed to co-ordinate their efforts to reduce distortions and impediments to agricultural trade." But not the slightest indication is given as to the mechanics of this co-ordination or what specific measures the two countries propose to take in concert to achieve this end. For example, what is the attitude of the two countries with regard to

[Mr. Stanfield.]

the suggestion made that the governing body of the world wheat agreement may propose a reduction in grain prices? In other words, judging from the communiqué and the annex, the ministers may have made some progress or they may have made very little. I believe the people of this country are entitled to know precisely what mechanics will be employed to follow up this general statement which may be no more than a pious hope of the efforts of the two countries to reduce distortions and impediments in this area.

There are references to underdeveloped countries; there is reference to cross-border trade in respect of certain agricultural commodities; there is talk about early consultations. But again, these mean nothing unless, in fact, arrangements have been made for the establishment of machinery to deal with the problems. There is nothing in the communiqué or the minister's statement which gives the people of this country any means of judging whether they are simply pious statements or whether, in fact, a foundation has been reached for some action.

With regard to the comment on energy resources, oil and other things, as far as the communiqué is concerned it adds nothing to the information we already have. However, I understood the minister to say that he proposes to take some initiative himself in this regard, commencing on Monday. As I understood him this morning, he said he would open discussions on Monday next with authorities of the United States regarding oil arrangement. I hope the minister will correct me if I am wrong. This provides one concrete bit of information that is not contained in the communiqué.

There is reference to the law of the sea having been discussed, but there is no indication whether any of the conflicting opinions between the two countries have been resolved in any way. Again, there is pious statement about seeking solutions to water and air pollution problems along our common frontier. However, there is no indication at all whether this is simply a pious statement or, in fact, concrete measures were discussed with a view to solving the problems.

This kind of meeting is useful; but surely, if we are to have effective participatory democracy we must have more solid information than the minister has given us. Surely parliament and the country are entitled to some frankness as to what differences of opinion there were and what real progress was made with regard to reaching solutions. We are entitled to statements going beyond