

Prime Minister say that Canadians were concerned with the cultural, economic and military consequences of our nearness to the United States. What do you think he had in mind when he used that word "military"? Was he thinking of NORAD? Did he have in mind the fact that today and tonight in Colorado a Canadian is there with our American allies to protect Canada from the threat of nuclear bombs, but not nuclear bombs from the United States? Is it possible to believe that the Prime Minister of Canada could go to Moscow, of all places, and express concern for Canada, military concern, because of her nearness to the United States?

My friends, there is an old canal in this city. It runs through our town with weeping willows and other trees growing over it. Very few people know or remember why that canal was built. It was built 150 years ago to protect this country from the United States. The fact that today it remains only a relic, little known and little remembered, is witness to the blessed trust that has existed between our two countries, the United States and Canada, for a century and a half. And to think that now, in the context of our world, in the light of the history of the past 25 years, the Prime Minister of Canada should go to Moscow, of all places, and there cast doubt upon our trust in the United States!

After all, for a generation the United States has possessed a nuclear power that could have blown Canada off the map of the world any night at all, and we Canadians went to bed every night and never thought of the possibility of such a thing. We Canadians today are paying and sacrificing with our allies to protect Canada from a nuclear holocaust from another country, and that country is not the United States. It is the country in the capital of which Mr. Trudeau took occasion to express his fears of our good friend and ally.

Hon. Mr. Martin: I am sure Senator O'Leary does not wish on a matter of such importance to convey, outside this house at any rate, wrong impressions. Could he produce anything that the Prime Minister said that would justify the wide and exaggerated interpretation he just made?

Hon. Mr. O'Leary: I refer to what he said the other night to the Russians. It was to court their favour, apparently, and to aid and comfort them in their clear efforts to create division between Canada and the United States. That is one of their policies; they have pursued it for years and they pursued it more successfully on the occasion of this visit of the Prime Minister of Canada. I say that the statement which I heard from the lips of the Prime Minister of Canada was one of the most mischievous and irresponsible statements made by a Canadian statesman since I have been observing public life, which is over 60 years.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: On what station and program was this broadcast to which you refer?

Hon. Mr. O'Leary: I refer to a televised statement from Moscow, broadcast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on Monday evening. I am sure you can obtain the

[Hon. Mr. O'Leary.]

transcript of the statements. He said that we were concerned in Canada over the cultural, economic and military consequences of our nearness to the United States. Surely that is plain enough? I repeat, that was the most irresponsible and mischievous statement made by a Canadian statesman in the foreign field since Confederation. I could say a lot more about this communiqué and about his visit, but I would be sorry to have said less than I have said.

Hon. Mr. Thompson: I should like to ask a question of the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Martin). Does he consider this protocol will cause a weakening of the Canadian official stand towards the status of the occupied Baltic nations and other such nations within the U.S.S.R.?

Hon. Mr. Martin: It must be obvious that any arrangement Canada would make with the Soviet Union for a greater exchange of views is bound to give Canada more opportunity to discuss matters that it believes to be of great importance.

Hon. Edward M. Lawson: Honourable senators, I should like to make a few comments, having listened very carefully to the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Martin) speak about this. I yield to no other senator in my love and affection for the United States. As an international unionist I participate with my American brothers. While having that feeling of affection for the United States, I do not think that in any way diminishes the right of this country and its leadership to make such visits. I do not quarrel with the principle to which Senator O'Leary referred, as enunciated by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King. That may be just as valid today as it was then.

As to the concern of many Canadians as I know them, and their reaction to the visit, it seems to me from what I have heard, what I have detected, and my own feeling, that anything that can be done by the leaders of this Government which promotes better understanding, goodwill and a better feeling between our two countries, while in no way diminishing our relations with our friends and neighbours to the south, is something that many thousands of Canadians support.

I listened carefully to Senator O'Leary's remarks, and I thought, as I heard it, the Prime Minister said something to the effect that it was a concern of the Canadian people. I think it is a concern of the Canadian people, as to American military power and so on. Whether it is a valid concern, whether it is a justified concern, whether it ignores or takes for granted the comfort we have had from the military protection of the United States, all these things notwithstanding, I think the Prime Minister had a right to make this statement and express it as a concern of the Canadian people. It matters not to me where he made that statement. The only criticism I would offer, which is not too justified, is that the trip should have taken place sooner because of the good it will accomplish.