

U.S.S.R.-Canada Protocol

so ready to go to far away places with strange sounding names, has so little interest in the on-the-spot conversations with the leaders of Great Britain, West Europe or the United States. Is it now thought that these areas are of diminishing interest or concern for Canada or for the people of the world? I fear that the people of this country must be among the first to suffer because of the downgrading of our interest and concern for West Europe and Britain.

The government, despite constant warnings by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and others, has not made meaningful adjustments to the likely trade outcome of Britain's entry into the European Common Market. The flurry of last minute interest by ministers would almost lead one to believe that they first heard about the British contemplation the week before last. Perhaps history may judge that the Prime Minister of Canada might better have been in Brussels rather than in Tashkent or even Samarkand. This House has taken up for discussion this day a matter of international concern because the government did not choose to make its secret document a subject for House discussion. We were without access to its contents beyond the mere statement which has been tabled. We do not have the information necessary to judge all its ramifications. So we face an important document in a very casual way. But we can, without hesitation, deplore the method whereby this protocol was adopted. I should like to say, Sir, that the denigration of Parliament becomes no more acceptable just because it becomes more and more common as month follows month.

Now, of course, any improvement in our contact with the Soviet Union and its people is welcome. I was not one of those who relished the brittle era of the cold war, nor would I aid or abet any of those who would wish to return to the narrow and rigid diplomacy of that period. Of course, we welcome detente. I was proud to be a supporter of the government of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) in its great extensions of trade, not only with the Soviet Union but with the Peoples Republic of China, which I believe had profound effects for good not only in this country but in the other countries as well. There is no reason there cannot be fruitful discussion with the government of the Soviet Union, but this must not be at the expense of others upon whom in the final analysis we must depend for such security as is vouchsafed to anybody in this insecure world of tension and trial.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: I would say again that we must be ever watchful lest the postures of popularity leads us away from the perceptions of reality. We are anxious to appear open-minded. Nobody wants to be called a red-baiter or narrow-minded nowadays. We must also always be broad in outlook. In fact, it is dangerous to oppose anything that is considered different. But in all this, we cannot forget the realities of the world situation. There was the event in Hungary in 1956. There is the Berlin

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

wall; we did not build it and the United States did not build it, neither did Great Britain build it. All of us here can remember the grim tidings of that summer morning in 1968 when that proud little country Czechoslovakia was brutally crushed and its flourishing new socialist freedom was obliterated. We cannot forget that the Baltic States are in thrall. These are people who had aspirations and hopes for development and countries which, for brief periods, flourished as sensitive democracies.

Can we ignore the plight of the Soviet Jew? Is there not an extension of Russian naval strength in the Mediterranean, in the Red Sea and in the Indian Ocean? Was there not such a thing as the Brezhnev doctrine announced a while ago and was it a pleasant thing to contemplate for those who knew of its dangers. In our desire for scientific talks and for ameliorated conditions let us not be totally bemused by the jubilation of the visit and the social harmony of the situation. Let us not forget to ask whether or not the hard questions were discussed. Were there really serious discussions about the deprivations of the fishery on the east coast which affect the livelihood of many decent Canadian people who make their living from the sea. Were there meaningful discussions about the future of the captive peoples? When the right hon. member for Prince Albert was the Prime Minister of this country, the Canadian delegation to the United Nations General Assembly took up the question of the people who were held in bondage by the Soviet Union. Should these things be forgotten? I hear very little reference to this in the House. Just because freedom is long suppressed it does not mean this issue should be forgotten.

• (12:40 p.m.)

What of the Ukraine? How fully was that situation discussed? What about the fishing in the troubled waters of the Middle East and the involvement there? There is a long list of serious matters which will remain on the table after the banquet hall is cleared and the guests have departed. Even a small contribution to the solution of some of these problems would be infinitely more valuable than grandiloquent exercises in self-congratulation on ephemeral accomplishments in an attempt to claim that, by one stroke of a prime ministerial pen, the world has been turned upside down and new eras have been entered into and old values kicked out.

I should like to say in conclusion that if this protocol is as important as designated by the Acting Prime Minister, then it should properly have been presented to Parliament and to the Canadian people as an important document rather than taken secretly out of the brief case and flourished before the people of the Soviet Union.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: If it is more public relations froth, it should not be deceptively presented to the Canadian people with over-exaggeration as to its import. I say to the government that on a question of such vital and