

hard to sell to the people back home but which could be met if they were compensated, whether they be citrus growers, wheat growers or hog producers, up to a point, from some international equalization fund? Is this too simplistic an approach to this problem?

Mr. Schaezel: I see what you are getting at. I am somewhat daunted as to how one would do it. I would try to extract from your question a suggestion, a philosophy, an approach. It seems to me that the demand placed on all of us—the Community, the United States, Canada, and, particularly, Japan—is to try to see the problem whole. One of the difficulties with Japan, for instance, is the extent to which they make a minimal contribution to the defence area. The United States defence contribution to their security is significant. This puts salt on all of these economic wounds as far as the United States is concerned. The Community, to take another case, in its effort to see the problem whole, is much more responsible vis-à-vis the less developed countries than we are. I thought a bit about drawing up some kind of balance sheet in which you take politics, psychology, defence, economic factors, and so forth, to see where you are standing. This, first, could give a perspective. Once you begin to get perspective, then, it seems to me, you could ask: How do you react to other people's very sensitive problems? There is an almost total absence of any generosity of spirit now. If you contrast this situation with the post-war period, you will see a striking change. There is a narrowness, a nastiness about international relations which is exceedingly discouraging.

If you had a balance sheet and a state of mind, for which you would not keep close, daily-entry books, then one country could come and say: "We have a horrible problem with the citrus lobby; it is very active and it is very important. There is not much trade. Can't you do something?" What the Community did in this area was really quite generous. It dealt with about 80 or 85 per cent of the problem. However, it was as though one was going to the dentist once a week for months in which the pain of getting that tooth temporarily fixed was really much worse than finally having it fixed properly.

There are some things which ought to be responsive to quiet diplomacy, when we have enough confidence to say, "We have this issue. Is there anything we can do about it?" If you begin a process of solving problems rather than worsening them—which is basically what we are now doing, or dramatizing them—and then put on top of that something that has been implicit in our discussion but which I should like to make explicit, which is to search for areas of co-operation, you can change the tone of international affairs; this can be done if you begin to put some emphasis on those things in which you are working together rather than always turning the spotlight on those things which are going wrong, and which will always go wrong. I would say what you are suggesting is the right conceptual approach, but I think it has to be less mechanistic.

Senator Rattenbury: I had three questions, but Mr. Schaezel has already answered most of what I wanted

to put to him, because his remarks have been very far-ranging. There is one question to which I would like an answer. A few years ago I was a member of a parliamentary group which stopped off in Brussels en route to Amsterdam. We were briefed by permanent officials of the EEC, which we found most interesting. I was struck with the number of times I listened, privately in social conversation rather than officially, to officials saying what a great thing it would be if the United Kingdom became a member of the EEC. The reasons given did not refer so much to trade as to the expertise that would come with the entry of the United Kingdom, and the fact that it would bring within the Community an international currency of a stature that was needed. Do you agree with those remarks?

Mr. Schaezel: I do indeed. I think the British have this enormous talent for government. If one might employ a loose metaphor, they are less the inspired Gothic architects than they are the skilled craftsmen. Their whole development from the year 800, I suppose, has been a highly pragmatic response to situation. This has been a process not without conflict, but substantially without the kinds of civil wars that have marked other societies. It seems to me this is a special talent. The way in which their civil service operates, the relationship between the civil service and the politicians, the civility about the country and the way they go about things, all lead me to think, as I have thought for a very long time—and this view is shared by many Europeans—that have an intellectual contribution that grows out of the people as such and their experience, which is precisely what the Community needs.

As I suggested before, this is a political experiment; they are trying to do something nobody has done. Mr. Heath said in one of his speeches in Washington that it is not going to be a United States of Europe, because it is not modelled on the United States' experience, any more than our experience was modelled on anybody else's. They are really ploughing an entirely new furrow, and it is in that sort of way that I think the British can make an important contribution.

Quite apart from that level, how do you make it work in practice? One of the major points of the October summit was the realization by the heads of government that it does not work very well, and they said, "This is one of the major problems. We have got to have recommendations on how to make it more efficient." In many cases they are prevented from doing what they want to do because they cannot make the machinery work. Man, with all his deficiencies, ought to be just good enough to solve this kind of problem. It is an area in which I think the British can make a real contribution.

The second part of the question relates to their financial role. I talked to my European friends, a number of whom happen to live in England, when I was there in November. I wanted to find out more about what was going on in the country, which obviously confronts many difficult economic, social and internal problems and then, Ulster. What they all refer to is the efficiency of The Street, the whole field of financial and other related international services. They play here from strength, and