

Warsaw Pact activities in the event that any of the subjugated nations become restive. Surely Canadians will not be so naive as to assume that this provision is designed for our benefit. Surely our relationship with the United States and our NATO allies would be affected. This is really nothing, except that Russia still wants to have the best of both worlds. In the May 20, 1971, edition of the *Toronto Telegram*, the Prime Minister is quoted as saying:

• (4:50 p.m.)

"Canada might risk losing her personality because of the overpowering United States neighbour, for which reason we have to diversify our relationships with other countries."

What a play on words! What a perversion of fact! We should have a complete debate in this House on the threat to which the Prime Minister has referred.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: If the government was really sincere, wanted meaningful discussion and wanted to take the Canadian people into its confidence, I suggest that this matter might have been handled differently.

Mr. Sharp: How?

Mr. McCutcheon: Are you still the Acting Prime Minister or are you—

Mr. Sharp: The Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. McCutcheon: The Secretary of State for External Affairs asks, "How?". This minister would not permit the matter to be brought before the House in government time. The Prime Minister was to arrive on Monday with a prepared speech and each of the opposition parties was to be given a few minutes in which to reply. Nothing would have come out of that except of five-minute exchange.

I wish to comment on the remarks made this morning by the then Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp). In my humble opinion he made a very specious argument. He compared this protocol with certain agreements made by previous governments. He referred to 1961 and other years. He was really comparing apples and watermelons, if we are to believe what the Prime Minister said this afternoon. These previous agreements, which were made without approval of the House—and he referred to that—do not have anything in common with this one. I make that statement having regard to the fact that the other agreements did not contain a change in policy or direction.

Mr. Sharp: Nor does this.

Mr. McCutcheon: The minister says "Neither does this," but this is not the inference that is being carefully put across to the Canadian people.

Mr. Sharp: By the opposition.

Mr. McCutcheon: I believe there are others who wish to participate in this debate, so I will not take any more

U.S.S.R.—Canada Protocol

time. I will conclude by saying that I am disturbed by certain developments in this country, some of which were alluded to last night on television by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart). He referred to certain Marxist students who were receiving government largess. I have in my hand an article which appeared in the *Toronto Telegram* pointing out the irony of the Canada Council awarding a \$3,500 grant to Mrs. Phyllis Clarke, former chairman of the metro Toronto Communist Party. Bearing that in mind, I wish to quote as follows from one of the nice little books entitled "Foreign Policy for Canadians," put out by the Department of External Affairs:

External activities should be directly related to national policies pursued within Canada, and serve the same objectives.

Perhaps this has passed unnoticed by many Canadians, but I suggest it is time that they were reminded. I repeat:

External activities should be directly related to national policies—

If our national policies are to support Marxists, where are we being led?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, a member of the Cr ditiste party has been waiting to speak for some time. With the unanimous consent of the House, perhaps we could continue for another five minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is very pleased to accept the suggestion. I know the hon. member would like to have a few minutes. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its great courtesy in allowing me to say a few words on the trip of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to the U.S.S.R.

We are pleased to see that the Prime Minister did not do things by halves. To my mind, the trip was timely and Canada should benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, as it is five o'clock, I do not want to keep the House too long, but I should like to congratulate the Prime Minister for the account he gave us of his beautiful trip; I also thank him for supplying us with a copy of the protocol and the report on the discussions he had with the representatives of that country.

We have to keep in direct contact with all countries of the world, regardless of their ideologies, their political philosophy and their economic system.

We must realize that there is something to be said for the economic policy of other countries even if we disagree with their ideologies. We are facing two great ideologies: capitalism and communism.

The capitalist system is good in some respect, even if it has serious deficiencies which should be corrected.

There are also deficiencies in the communist system, as unlike capitalism it deprives certain citizens of their freedom.