

*Economic Relations with United States*

There, Mr. Speaker, is an expression of the kind of courageous leadership that this nation requires as it moves into one of the most difficult phases of its history. There stand the Tory statesmen with feet firmly planted, one on each side of the fence, issuing the traditional clarion call of Canadian politicians in difficulty—"Join us in confused inaction". If I did not know the source of this motion I would have sworn that it emanated from the Liberal party. It sounds like something Mackenzie King would have said were he here today. Indeed, I suspect that the motion was written by Eddie Goodman sitting in Laurier House. That, at least, would explain the clear case of schizophrenia which has gripped the person who prepared the motion.

• (3:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) yesterday presented us with a highly emotional defence of his motion. It was emotional by necessity since one obviously cannot employ logic in speaking in its favour. Following one of the more sentimental passages which drew appropriate reactions from other members of the House, the hon. member for Hillsborough obliquely charged that hon. members were being intellectually indecent. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker: if anything was intellectually indecent in this House yesterday, it was the speech of the hon. member for Hillsborough. When I see a man such as the hon. member for Hillsborough, whom I personally admire, representing a party for which I have a great deal of respect, the party of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Robert Borden and Arthur Meighen, consciously and deliberately hurl himself into the depths of intellectual dishonesty, I become depressed and angry. This motion reeks with intellectual dishonesty, an intellectual dishonesty motivated by the crassest political cupidity.

This resolution was carefully designed to create the impression that Canada, by taking a slightly more independent stance on foreign affairs, had betrayed its ancient ally, was cozying up to the Godless communists, and that in righteous anger the United States government had smitten us with the 10 per cent surtax. I know that the hon. member did not say that in so many words, but that was the impression he was seeking to leave. One need hardly say that such is a total and complete misrepresentation of the situation.

In the name of what noble cause has the Conservative party perpetrated this disservice to the nation? In the name of more votes at the next election and more money for its next election war chest. The Conservatives know that there are sizeable numbers of people in this country who suffered terrible indignities in Eastern Europe and who undoubtedly as a result view attempts at east-west rapprochement with mistrust. Tory strategists obviously wish to fan the flames of fear in the breasts of such people in the hope that that fear will be transformed into Tory votes at the next election.

The Conservative party is attempting to create a species of sophisticated neo-McCarthyism. It is attempting to form an unholy alliance between the right-wing extremists of the Edmund Burke sort and persons who, because of terrible personal experiences, legitimately mistrust the governments of eastern Europe and the People's Republic of China. That kind of raw political opportunism stinks to

[Mr. Rowland.]

high heaven and is unworthy of the Progressive Conservative party.

But what is beneath contempt is the other political pay-off that the Conservatives expect, that of having their warchest swelled by funds from United States corporations operating in Canada. They learned through bitter experience in 1962 and 1963 that U.S. corporations in Canada are extremely nervous about even the most watered down manifestations of an independence of spirit on the part of Canada, and that they will do whatever is necessary to crush it if a Canadian political party gives them the opportunity. The Liberals gave them that opportunity in 1962 and 1963, to the eternal shame of that party and to the discomfiture of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). The Tory party has now determined to play that role. As I said, that is crass political cupidity.

What makes me even more angry is that the whole exercise is not only intellectually dishonest, in direct opposition to this country's best interests, but it is also bloody stupid and completely inept. This motion is making those do-nothing continentalists on the other side of the House look good. To my horror, yesterday I found myself applauding on occasion the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). The Liberal party, which more than any other institution in this country has contributed to Canada's becoming virtually an economic fiefdom of the United States, is coming out of this debate sounding like the guardian of Canadian independence, courtesy of the Tory party.

Just what has the government done that is so bold and innovative? It has recognized the People's Republic of China. Britain and France did that in 1949. We in the New Democratic Party have been demanding such action for years and so, by implication, have western Tories who have cried for increased grain sales to that country. The government has voted to have the People's Republic of China seated in the United Nations. This the hon. member for Hillsborough called a cruel act. This "cruel act" was supported by two-thirds of the membership of that organization. Is it a cruel act to say that the effective government of China is the government in Peking which rules 600 million Chinese rather than the government of Taiwan which rules approximately three million Chinese and another 10 million or so highly discontented Taiwanese? What bold steps has this government taken which would have the effect of shaking United States confidence in us? Was it because the government invited Marshal Tito for a visit? He was in Washington first. Was it because the government invited Mr. Kosygin for a visit? Mr. Nixon himself is going to the Soviet Union to see him.

What bold actions that are contrary to the interests of the United States have we taken? We have allowed our dollar to float, which is in accordance with United States desires. We have the lowest tariffs in our history, which is also in accordance with United States desires. This government has seen to it that Canada lay supine as Canadian industry after Canadian industry and Canadian resource after Canadian resource has fallen into the hands of foreign corporations. The rate of take-over after the war of about 50 corporations a year has now risen to 175 a year. This is the government which in principle part has presided over the development of a branch plant