

nection with an unjustified request on behalf of A. Sakharov." The reply read:

I am sure that you will find means to inform the members of the Canadian Parliament who signed the petition of the reasons which prevent the Embassy from complying with their request, as the petition cannot be qualified otherwise than an interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. In the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on European Security it is stated, in particular, that "The participating states will refrain from any interference, direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the internal or external affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating state, regardless of their mutual relations".

A reply was sent to the Soviet Embassy by Senator Eugene Forsey, which, with his kind permission, I should like to read:

I must first express my surprise that your letter should have been addressed to the Clerk of either House, and not to the signatories of the document you had received. That document was in no sense a document of either House: it was a petition from individual members of both Houses. Neither House, and no official of either House, had any responsibility for it whatever.

I am equally surprised that you invoke the provisions of the Helsinki Declaration in this matter. The passage you quote from the Declaration says that "The participating states will refrain from any interference, direct or indirect, individual or collective," etc. My colleagues and I are not "states", a point which has apparently escaped Your Excellency's notice. We are neither a state, nor a collection of states. The Helsinki Declaration, in the passage you quoted, refers solely to "states, . . . individual or collective" (that is, one state or a group of states).

In any event, how can our petition be described as "interference" in the affairs of the Soviet Union? We have an English proverb, "A cat can look at a king." Surely any citizen, of any state, can address to the Government of any state, a request, or plea, or petition, asking that Government to take, or not to take, a certain action?

If the Helsinki Declaration is to be interpreted in the fashion you appear to suggest in your letter, then the passages in it dealing with human rights and freedoms are just waste paper.

At this time we should take serious note of the recent visit of Mr. Joseph Luns, the Secretary-General of NATO. He spoke to the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association on February 4, 1976, and next day to the Canadian Club in Ottawa. The *Globe and Mail* of February 5 published a short news item, captioned: "Soviet intervention in Angola imperils détente, Luns warns." He stated that the Soviet Union has successfully mounted a military operation "way beyond its sphere of influence." Soviet achievements in Angola might lead to intervention in other parts of Africa. He said that there is a contradiction in the way East and West regard détente. He is quoted as saying:

The Western allies tend to regard détente as a move toward friendship and warm co-operation, but Warsaw Pact countries consider it little more than a tool to provide international stability while they build up their military might with the help of Western technology.

He went on to say that although the Soviet Union is not "a great success in human terms," it is "a superpower in military terms," and would not hesitate to use its military power to back political aims. Mr. Luns concluded by saying that if it gains political domination of Europe, "I do not believe that the free democratic institutions of either Canada or the United States could survive for long." A very grave warning.

The Twenty-first Annual Session of the North Atlantic Assembly, held from September 21 to September 26, 1975, in Copenhagen, Denmark, made the Helsinki Agreement the subject of close scrutiny, about which I reported to the Senate on December 4, 1975. In the resolutions it was recognized that "détente does not mean an end to deep political and ideological differences," but it is at the present time "the only valid alternative to policies of crises and confrontation." Great emphasis was placed on "a comprehensive application of the Helsinki Principles," particularly on the free movement of people and information. The most important request to the member governments of NATO was that they "monitor carefully the implementation of human, cultural, educational, and information obligations in the Helsinki Agreement so that a detailed accounting may be presented to the follow-up conference in Belgrade in June 1977."

Honourable senators, I should like to repeat what I stated in this chamber on December 4, 1975:

NATO is the bulwark of freedom and democracy in the world, the front line of defence against the aggression of totalitarian, imperialistic powers. . . The power of the Soviet Union has been increasing at an alarmingly rapid pace, surpassing NATO's conventional forces and equipment. The Western democracies are today faced with the greatest threat since the inception of NATO, offset only partially by the rising power of Red China. This is no time for complacency. We must be alert and prepared for the worst eventuality. NATO must not be allowed to be weakened, but must be strengthened in every respect. Consequently, Canada, rich in natural resources but vulnerable, must not lag behind. Our government must commit our country to a greater responsibility and role in the North Atlantic Alliance to keep this world safe for freedom and democracy.

On motion of Senator Petten, debate adjourned.

● (1510)

THE SENATE

TELEVISION AND RADIO COVERAGE OF HOUSE AND COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Greene, P.C., calling the attention of the Senate to the desirability of permitting complete television and radio coverage of the proceedings of the