

*U.S.S.R.-Canada Protocol*

He might as well have mentioned the pitiful amount of money this government has contributed to the cultural betterment of these people as compared to moneys contributed in respect of biculturalism and bilingualism.

**Mr. Sharp:** Are you opposed to bilingualism?

**Mr. Baldwin:** Let me read the next two paragraphs.

However, we must strongly object to the Prime Minister's statement in which he made comparison between Canada's federal and democratic form of government and the totalitarian colonial system by means of which Soviet Russia rules over some 125 million people of non-Russian nations, of which Ukraine is the largest with a population of 47 million.

Under no circumstances can the democratic and federal system of Canada be equated with the one-party Soviet Russian dictatorship which uses secret trials, forced labour camps and other means of police rule for political and imperialistic purposes. The U.S.S.R. is in fact the only and the greatest colonial empire in the world today.

These are the views of the people. I put this on record to show that there is not the universal approbation in this country which the Prime Minister and others of his party suggest exists. Let me read from an editorial which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* last Thursday under the heading "Historic Indeed":

The Canadian-Russian treaty signed in Moscow is officially described as a "protocol". By insisting on this distinction the Trudeau government achieves two purposes of political importance. Protocol is a somewhat antiseptic term and hence useful to ministers preparing to pretend, when not preening themselves on their achievement—

These are not my words, but I adopt them.

—as world statesmen, that they have entered into a simple agreement for the encouragement of cultural, environmental and scientific exchanges. Moreover, their diplomatic stroke is a *fait accompli*; they do not have to seek ratification of a "protocol" by the Canadian Parliament.

In fact, the treaty is another significant step in the reversal of long-established Canadian policy. Mr. Sharp in Parliament called it "historic," as it may well be. The cordiality of the Soviet leaders is not surprising. Will you walk into my parlour, said the calculating spider to the innocent flies. And in walked Messrs. Sharp and Trudeau.

The people of Canada have been hoodwinked, in company with their allies. First, we had the elaborate foreign policy exercise which was intended to weaken our NATO ties under cover of professions of loyalty. Doubters were reassured by pointed references to the text of the Prime Minister's announcement of April, 1969, which emphasized our continuing membership. Now that the dust has settled we have the second move, a Moscow agreement creating a special relationship between Canada and the Soviet Union.

Without adopting in toto the principles of the suggestions contained in this editorial, I put this on record to add to the growing list of pronouncements and statements made by many people in Canada who have doubts about the statement of the Prime Minister on what he has done or signed, accompanied as it was by all the surrounding statements. This action was not accompanied by the wholesale approbation of the people of Canada.

Finally, hot off the press today, in the *Toronto Star* we have this article. You will notice I am quoting from papers which are not entirely unsympathetic to some of the very few reasonable proposals this government

[Mr. Baldwin.]

makes from time to time. This editorial is headed "Scene of the Crime" and it reads:

Honestly, we wouldn't have mentioned it, if he hadn't raised the subject himself. It was a sickening, disgusting and frightening affair, that brutal Soviet crackdown on Czechoslovakia in August, 1968. But people did nothing about it at the time, and there's been a tacit agreement since to let it alone.

But this week, Russian Communist party boss Leonid Brezhnev went, fresh from the Trudeau's, to Prague, where he boasted about his 1968 dirty work, and carefully repeated the nauseous "Brezhnev Doctrine," meaning he'll do it all over again, if he ever feels he has to. Since Mr. Brezhnev has been so tactless, we incline to being outspoken ourselves. There are 80,000 Russian troops still in Czechoslovakia. The deposed and disgraced Czech leader, Alexander Dubcek, is their butt. In his place, put there by Soviet brute force, is Gustav Husak, who saved Dubcek's life, but only by licking Brezhnev's boots. And 300,000 Czech Communists have been purged.

The obsequious praise that Husak heaped on Brezhnev in public when they met this week would have turned a normal man's stomach, but Mr. Brezhnev lapped it up.

An ear less tin might have detected an odd little note in the paean. Husak affirmed the need to defeat "right-wing opportunists, revisionists and anti-social forces". But these are precisely the terms the Chinese employ for abusing the Russians. Husak may not be quite the toady Mr. Brezhnev thinks. The Czechs have a long tradition of quietly needling their conquerors. Ever hear of "the good soldier Schweik," Mr. Brezhnev?

● (4:10 p.m.)

I have a great many of these quotations which I could place on the record. Hon. members might fall over themselves praising everything they have done, but I believe it is up to them and the people of the country to examine with care and caution what has been done and what is being done. Good things we accept, however, and there may be some good come out of this. We hope this will be the case. We will check into it as time goes by.

The right hon. gentleman said today that he had mentioned to the Chairman certain problems which now exist between Canada and the U.S.S.R., such as the question of the Jewish people trying to leave Russia, the fishery problem which exists and which has been the subject of speeches by many members on this side of the House, the question of immigration, and so on. We will watch with care and interest what comes out of this. If in fact there are compensating features and improvements which take place, we will be prepared to give credit to the Prime Minister even though these might take place in any event.

However, this does not alter the fact that the right hon. gentleman fled Canada because of the problems he faced domestically. We have heard of the retreat from Moscow. Now we hear about the retreat to Moscow of the right hon. gentleman and his friends. Napoleon went one way and the right hon. gentleman went another way. We will watch with care and we will file a caveat in respect of the development which is taking place.

We have exercised our responsibility as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition because of the dismal failure of the government to set aside appropriate time to discuss this matter—because it is either an historical and important event, as has been suggested, or it is nothing. If it is as important as the Secretary of State for External Affairs