

Inquiries of the Ministry

understand, are to be made after the legislation has been dealt with in committee, has gone through the House of Commons and before it has passed the other place.

NATIONAL DEFENCE**REPORTED APPROACH BY RUSSIA FOR GREATER CO-OPERATION**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I wished to direct to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but in his absence I would like to direct it to the Minister of National Defence. Can he advise the house whether Canada has received overtures from the Soviet union for bilateral military contacts or co-operation, similar to arrangements between this country and France?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I believe the proper answer to that question is that there is no foundation for it.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. Was an invitation received from the Russian government to send a senior military officer to Moscow to attend their fiftieth anniversary celebrations, and was Canada the only NATO country to receive such an invitation?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, my information is that no such invitation was extended to any Canadian officials.

Mr. Harkness: Does the minister mean there was no invitation extended at all, contrary to what has been reported? He says there was no invitation to any officer, but did any general invitation come to the government?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I cannot answer for other departments of the government, but so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned there was no invitation received.

TRADE**DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING PROPOSED U.S. IMPORT RESTRICTIONS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister but in his absence may I direct it to the Minister of Finance. It has to do with the

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Prime Minister's statement in Toronto on Saturday to the effect that if the United States follows through on trade restrictive proposals, Canada will have to re-examine the concessions which it granted at the Kennedy round talks in Geneva.

I want to ask the Minister of Finance whether he or the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the government generally have received any assurance from the United States government that all effective steps will be taken so there will be no restrictive proposals or any quotas imposed on Canadian goods, particularly those affected by the Kennedy round.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can answer that question by quoting the President of the United States himself. Addressing the Consumer Assembly in Washington he said:

I think those protectionist bills just must not become law. And they're not going to become law as long as I am president.

That is the best answer I can give to the question of whether we have received assurances on this matter, but may I add that there should be no doubt whatever in the minds of those in the United States who are advocating these restrictions on imports, in contravention of trade agreements, that such action would cause damage to the trade interests of the United States. Surely the United States, which has done so much to advance the cause of freer world trade, isn't going to withdraw into a policy of protectionism, a beggar thy neighbour policy.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Finance whether there will be sufficient flexibility in the legislation he is introducing which will give the governor in council not only power to postpone the implementation of the Kennedy round agreements but power to withdraw them in the event that any of the other signatories resort to import quotas which would nullify all the benefits of the Kennedy round agreements?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to give a categorical answer on the question of the law. I would have to refresh my memory, but I can assure my hon. friend that I will be looking at our law in the light of that possibility.

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): As a supplementary question, in view of the fact that a majority two thirds vote in the United States congress can nullify the presidential