

renewed impetus to negotiations toward the Agreement on Co-operation in the Industrial Application of Science and Technology, signed on behalf of Canada by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) in January of this year. Canada has responded and is continuing to respond to these Soviet initiatives carefully, after due thought, and in pursuit of our own national aims and objectives.

At the same time we have not hesitated to let the Soviet Union know, in the clearest possible terms, when we disagree with them. This was done, for instance, in the cases of the invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia and the trials of Soviet Jewish citizens in Leningrad. Hon. members should not assume that consultative arrangements like the Protocol are useful only with nations with whom we are basically in agreement. Indeed, they can be more useful where there are fundamental disagreements. By signing this Protocol, Mr. Kosygin has indicated Soviet willingness to discuss with us matters of Soviet policy that may be causing us trouble and distress.

This review of the development of Canada-U.S.S.R. relations since the war has been sketchy and selective. It is not my purpose today to give a history lesson, but to remind the House that despite setbacks there has been a steady, if slow, improvement in our contacts with the Soviet Union. The House knows this. It is difficult for me to understand how hon. members opposite can suggest that the signing of a protocol providing for more systematic consultations is a sudden act, a surprise to them, or a departure rather than a development in east-west relations.

Although it is an important and historic development, as I have said, we share some very basic concerns with the Soviet Union. As the two principal circumpolar powers we both have a special responsibility for the Arctic. We both have endless tracts of tundra, rich in mineral resources but presenting developmental and ecological problems of the greatest magnitude. In this area there is a great deal that we can learn from the Soviet Union. In the field of technology and secondary industry there may be something they can learn from us.

It is not by an accident of history that Canada has entered into a series of arrangements for consultation in the last decade. It is the working out in practice of the new dynamic diplomacy that has been made possible by the great development in the means of communication. Ministers and officials of governments need no longer rely only on written and telegraphic communications; they can meet regularly, at short notice, and discuss face-to-face problems of bilateral or worldwide concern. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that in this new era of dynamic diplomacy we can avoid the misunderstandings and miscalculations that in the past have led to global conflicts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

Regional Development

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

REGULARITY OF TABLING OF THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE TO HOUSE—RULING ON POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps hon. members might want me to refer at this time to a point of order raised earlier today by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). I appreciate that the hon. member is not with us at the moment, although he was in the House until the last minutes of this morning's sitting. Because of the urgency of the matter to which he referred in the course of his submission to the House, I thought I should give my ruling at this time before we resume debate on the motion now before the chamber.

The hon. member for St. John's East rose on a point of order in relation to proceedings on the estimates of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the Standing Committee on Regional Development. The hon. member suggests that there was some impropriety in appointing members to a standing committee after that committee was seized of his motion, and that the naming of members in that way was an abuse of Standing Order 64 (4) (b).

If the hon. member's proposition is valid, I suggest that it would be exceedingly difficult to ever effect a change in the membership of a committee. It does seem to me that there are innumerable occasions when a question is under consideration in a committee, on a continuing basis, from one meeting to another; indeed I am reliably informed that some committees sit for weeks on the same question. If this is the case, as I believe it is, then it would seem to be most impractical for the House to adopt the position that the membership of committees should not be altered while a motion is under debate or under consideration in the committee.

The hon. member also went on to suggest that a vote could not be taken in that committee because the bells had begun ringing to call members to the House for its daily sitting at two o'clock in the afternoon or at 11 a.m. on a Friday. I am wondering whether that suggestion will bear up in view of the provision of section (8) of Standing Order 65 which provides that standing Committees may sit while the House is sitting. It may be that the hon. member's point is to the effect that a quorum was not present when estimate number (1) of the department in question was carried in the committee. That is a very difficult question for the Chair to decide with the particulars now at hand. It does seem to me that the question of a quorum should have been resolved in the committee and I might point out that the hon. member has stated that he, himself, withdrew from the committee.

It may be that the report in question could be returned to the committee, but there is the question whether any useful purpose might be served in doing so. Hon. mem-