

*Canada—U.S. Ministerial Meeting*

Again we are not given any specific information other than the statement from the communiqué that the United States members reaffirm their readiness to consult promptly on any transactions of importance to Canada which are affected by United States foreign assets control.

Mr. Speaker, this does not answer the concrete questions. Is there to be any repetition of the deplorable situation which arose last summer when three milling companies in this country, wholly owned subsidiaries of United States corporations, refused to mill Canadian wheat into flour because that flour was going to be sold by the Soviet Union to Cuba. Has the government received any undertaking that there will be no repetition of this kind of incident which makes Canada look like nothing other than an economic satellite of the United States?

There is one last observation in the statement of the minister which intrigues me; that is the one which says that at no time did Secretary Rusk press for any contribution other than that which the Canadian government decides in the light of these responsibilities—referring of course to the Viet Nam situation. Knowing with what care the Secretary of State for External Affairs selects his words, sometimes in order to clarify a situation and sometimes in order to confuse it, I am intrigued by the word "press".

When the minister says that Secretary of State Rusk did not press for any contribution, I want to know whether he has asked for any; I want to know whether he has suggested any. I want the minister at the earliest opportunity to tell the house exactly what position the Canadian delegates took at the Washington meeting. It is not enough for us to hide behind the fact that we are a member of the International Control Commission.

It seems to me the Secretary of State had a clearly defined responsibility to make it clear to the United States that since they have intervened unilaterally in southeast Asia, the Canadian government feels no responsibility to give any support whatsoever in this military venture irrespective of whether or not we are a member of the International Control Commission.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, we listened intently to the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin).

23033—144

I thank him for sending me a copy of his press release. But I call his attention to the fact that he has sent me an English copy. We hear all the ministers of the crown tell us that there are two official languages in Canada. I wonder a little what the reaction of the Leader of the Opposition would have been if he had received that statement in French without an English copy.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** If it is true that I have sent an English copy to the hon. member, I must say that the French copy which should have been sent to him was received by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas).

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to inform his departmental officials that the leader of the Créditistes is not the leader of the New Democratic party and that we do not want the leader of the New Democratic party with the Créditistes.

Mr. Speaker, I see four main items in the minister's statement.

First, American investments in Canada;

Second, trade with the communist countries, for which we must secure the Americans' blessing;

Third, the situation in Viet Nam;

Fourth, co-operation in other areas with the United States, in this case the matter of water pollution with regard to the Great Lakes, etc.

But there is one point which we must consider a little more closely, because the statement does not change in any way the statements which we have been hearing in the house in the last month and a half, that is since the opening of the new session. I would even say that there is not much change between last year and this year.

Here is the paragraph which caught our attention and was read a short while ago by the Leader of the Official Opposition. Here it is:

*[English]*

We reiterated in some detail our views on the implications for Canada of the United States guide lines, regarding direct investment as they have been commonly understood, and our objections to them. The United States response made it clear that there is no thought that these guide lines given to their corporations should lead to companies in Canada being requested to operate other than in accordance with their normal commercial activities.