

niality as was shown to me by persons in every city I visited. I am particularly grateful to Mr. Kosygin who spent some 20 hours with me and whose daughter acted throughout the visit as the hostess for my wife.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that I was given the opportunity to make the trip. I am happy to be back. I am happy at what appears to be the favourable results of the visit.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I join the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) in welcoming the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) back from his journey. As he may have surmised from this debate, we have followed with interest his peregrinations through the various parts of the Soviet Union. I regret that he was compelled, upon landing in this country, to come to the House of Commons for this debate. I assume that he has learned by now that it has arisen as a result of the regrettable refusal of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) who in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister refused what I consider to be our very reasonable request that the government should set aside for debate and discussion the treaty and surrounding, connected matters which were entered into while the Prime Minister was in the Soviet Union.

My own preference would have been for the Prime Minister to have reported: then suitable arrangements could have been made among the various parties to set aside one or two days to debate this important issue and the surrounding circumstances flowing from this trip and treaty. The Secretary of State for External Affairs refused this and challenged us, in effect, to bring this subject forward on the first available opposition day in the House of Commons. We had no alternative to so doing. That action has brought the Prime Minister here. I am glad he is here, and I was glad to hear what he had to say.

Let it not be said, Mr. Speaker, that this party or anyone in it objects to discussions, negotiations and consultations between this country and any country in the world, including the Soviet Union.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: That has not been the issue in this debate. The right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) when speaking indicated the extent to which this practice has been followed in the past. The practice was initiated to a large extent by the government he led when he was Prime Minister. What concerned us and what impelled us to bring about this debate were the circumstances surrounding the institution of the so-called protocol, what was said in Russia and what was said here. I am quite sure that if this protocol had been executed without the fanfare which accompanied it, and without the proud claims and boasts made in this country and in the Soviet Union, there would have been discussions and there would have been a statement made by the Prime Minister on motions. We must look at the surrounding circumstances. Hon. members have quoted the Prime Minister's statements and I will

not repeat them, but they referred to the historic nature of this particular arrangement.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs, in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister, made a report to the House in which he emphasized this. The only impression we got in this House, which I am sure the country got, was that the government was embarking on a completely new course, in a new direction, and was engaged in charting a voyage in new waters.

Mr. Sharp: That was your interpretation.

Mr. Baldwin: That was the impression derived in this House and in this country. The hon. gentleman cannot deny that. I will have some references to establish that point before I conclude. Something has been said about whether this is a protocol or a treaty, and what should be done about it. I do not care what you call it—it is what is in the document that is important. The important thing is what was said at the time of its execution and what was said by the apologists who accompanied the Prime Minister and reported on it. There can be no doubt at all that the impression created by the Prime Minister, his entourage, his staff here and the Acting Prime Minister was that this was something new, substantial and different.

It is true that this document reduces certain proposals to writing, but there is nothing in the protocol with regard to the future which could not have been, and was, done in the past.

Mr. Bigg: It was done before he went there.

Mr. Baldwin: The impression which must remain indelibly in our mind is that this is intended to be something new, significant and tremendously important. It is for this reason we asked for this debate. Having listened to the Prime Minister, I must say we are not much wiser than we were before he returned.

An hon. Member: You didn't listen.

Mr. Baldwin: Something has been said about the tremendous approval surrounding this document.

An hon. Member: His speech was a good travelogue.

Mr. Laing: Are you sorry, or are you glad?

Mr. Baldwin: There are varying opinions about this document throughout Canada and it will take time for the dust to settle. Let it be said that there are grave misgivings in certain parts of Canada, not with regard to the mere existence of a protocol but because of the surrounding circumstances, its execution and statements made in Russia and in Canada. Let me put a few comments on the record. I have here a letter dated May 26, 1971, addressed to the then Acting Prime Minister from the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. The first paragraph reads:

Ukrainian Canadians received with great appreciation the remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister Trudeau in his state dinner speech in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, in which he emphasized the important contribution Ukrainians have made to the development of Canada while preserving their Ukrainian identity within Canada's cultural mosaic.