

in the last two or three days. Do we, or do we not, have a new detente? Are we not fooling ourselves, because our Prime Minister with a tulip between his teeth can parade through Red Square, that this will make any more doves of peace fly through the world?

Does the fact that the Bolshoi ballet may be one of the better ballets in the world remove the Berlin wall? I think not. I say with some hesitation that I have no confidence whatsoever in the international dialogue, monologue or prescience of the Prime Minister who not so many years ago thought the Second World War was a war of imperialism. It is that type of theoretical, idealistic philosophy which was wrong then and which, if it means anything to the Soviet Union, could get us into a lot of trouble.

In saying this I do not want to fall into the same trap in which the Minister of National Defence tried to put the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness) earlier, when he said that the hon. member was against discussion, against consultation and against negotiation. The minister used a word which the hon. member for Calgary Centre did not even use, in trying to paraphrase what the hon. member said about the words of Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brandt—that we have things to gain in talking to our Russian friends the same as we have things to gain in communicating with the Chinese. We have things to gain in communicating with the Hungarians, the Czechoslovakians and many other people under the suppression of the Russian bear. Of course there should be discussion and communication on technology, on science and on the development of the north. There should be more bilateral arrangements and discussions. The hon. member for Calgary Centre did not use the word “gain”.

Of course Mr. Nixon knows that to achieve world peace one has to talk to the big superpower; and that is why Mr. Nixon might want to do what we have done in recognizing China, because it is unreal to have one of the largest countries in the world outside the community of nations. There is a difference between what the hon. member for Calgary Centre said and what I am trying to say and the interpretation by the Minister of National Defence or his misrepresentation.

It is not that we disagree that we should have communication and discussion with the Soviet Union or be receptive to any overture from them. But how should we interpret what was evidently said by our Prime Minister yesterday in a press conference, after signing the protocol, that it was necessary to further develop agreements with Russia to maintain our own culture? Those are the words which I read in the press and which may have been misquoted.

Apparently we have much to learn from the Russians in a cultural or political way. I could ask many rhetorical questions such as, what do we have to learn from the Russians in a political or economic way? One could follow that through further than I intend today, but I suggest that their whole economic infrastructure and their whole economic philosophy leaves little for us to emulate. Quite the opposite, they could learn something from this society, even though questions might be put

National Security Measures

regarding how “just” it is from time to time. We know it is not always pure, but at least it is more open than some other societies.

I do not know who has more to learn about freedom. One could talk to people in Hungary and Czechoslovakia who could tell us a lot about freedom. I suggest that while Canadians should be receptive and have a positive frame of mind regarding bilateral arrangements in areas of science and technology and some other things mentioned in the protocol tabled in *Hansard* of Thursday, we should be most concerned and on guard and not misled by this new detente that seems to have sprung out of nowhere.

Let us not forget that another Prime Minister in the Liberal party went to Germany in 1938 and thought that Mr. Hitler was a rather interesting individual. That was Mackenzie King. And a British Prime Minister, Mr. Chamberlain, had a similar attitude. I am not suggesting that the Soviet Union is necessarily like Mr. Hitler's Germany, but there are some aspects of it which certainly should not receive universal acclaim from Members of Parliament, regardless of the party to which they belong.

For this reason we should be careful and cautious not to let the euphoria of tulips in the springtime in Moscow affect our readiness to participate in a meaningful way in the defence arrangements which have allowed us liberty, licence and sometimes excesses in this country. Anyone who suggests that you can lie down and play dead, be unentangled and uninvolved, should look at such countries as Russia, Sweden or Switzerland to find out that there is little involvement there.

● (4:50 p.m.)

Why should we be neutral? Why should we be a vacuum? In fact, we cannot be a vacuum living next to the United States. This is the part I am most suspicious about, that a Prime Minister who has travelled more through Russia and China than he has travelled in the United States thinks things are so odious to the south of us that he has to counterbalance them with entanglements and arrangements with Russia. It is that type of philosophy that produces this type of reasoning. However theoretical or idealistic it may be, it just does not work out in the world of reality and we must remember our history and the many things that we have shared with the people to the south of us. But with that general caveat applied to the question of the protocol on consultations, when the Prime Minister returns I would like him to explain paragraph 2, which reads:

In the event of a situation arising which, in the opinion of the two governments, endangers the maintenance of peace or involves a breach of the peace—

—there are to be consultations. When our Prime Minister is talking to Brezhnev and President Kosygin, would he find out if that is going to apply in the case of Hungary, of Czechoslovakia, of Korea and Viet Nam? And if it would apply, is it the case that the Russian bear would just open one ear and then go on to do what he was going to do anyway, and are we just fooling ourselves?

I suggest that a country like Canada, that could have participated in a meaningful way in the Southeast Asia