

I will not soon forget the opportunity of being at the United Nations in 1963 when two world powers brought us to the very razor edge of a lethal confrontation, but finally they looked at matters and at one another squarely and found a course of action that just in time moved us all away from the abyss. But it is not to these factors and areas over which we do not have control that I want to direct our attention today. We must look at our own conduct of Canadian foreign policies and ask if any new ingredients have been added recently which have brought new concern to our own people, or surprise, mystification and anxiety to many of our friends abroad.

In the *Ottawa Citizen* of October 28 I read a Canadian Press report which stated:

One senior Liberal MP said "there is nothing wrong with developing closer ties with Russia. In advancing the process of this friendship Mr. Trudeau went to Russia and made a gratuitous insult about an American military threat to Canada, and then Premier Kosygin comes here and criticizes American economic policy. Is that any way to make new friendships."

Another member of Parliament, the very distinguished member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), who has had extensive experience at the United Nations and other international bodies, wrote in his weekly column:

—we must not permit ourselves to be used by the Soviet or any other government for the purpose of breaking up ancient friendships and important alliances. We should not become a backboard channel for attacks on the United States. We should be careful in making new friends, that we do not offend our old friends.

When these matters to which members of the opposing party refer are brought up, we should be concerned, they should be concerned, and I commend them for being concerned, because it is our right and duty to do some serious thinking and make a careful analysis of such matters.

The leader of my party is not one who is given to extreme or inflammatory statements, but I believe he spoke for the great majority of Canadians when he said a couple of days ago:

—it is perfectly legitimate . . . for Canada to improve its relations with the Soviet Union. It is inappropriate, it is stupid for Canadian spokesmen to use a Soviet platform, or to encourage Soviet leaders to use a Canadian platform to attack the United States.

The leader of my party was in China a matter of months ago, and he was in the Soviet Union prior to that. I am sure he spoke there with his usual candour and forthrightness, as well as his moderation. I am sure he displayed the friendliness which has always characterized him, but it is notable that in these discussions he did not find it necessary in establishing *entree* with the leaders of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China to denigrate, denounce or even to snipe at the United States. I am indeed confident that he made a worthy contribution toward better understanding between that country and the countries he was visiting. We are all supposed to be in favour of that.

If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) can do it, I would suggest that others less restrained and less moderate might, in the words of Patrick Henry, profit by his example. No one suggests that this country need or should react with supine acceptance to every diplomatic lead of the United States. This has never been necessary before. I had the honour of supporting a government a few years ago which found itself capable and competent of disagree-

ing vigorously and forcefully with the United States when Canadian interests were endangered.

An hon. Member: It was fighting with them all the time.

Mr. Macquarrie: It is too bad I cannot reciprocate. I do not believe in making my speeches from the posture that the hon. gentleman is displaying, so I cannot do so. If he is enjoying himself, he can go right ahead.

Mr. Baldwin: We would have more intelligent heckling if you did so.

Mr. Macquarrie: I do not believe the Canadian delegation at the United Nations should have voted for the United States resolution regarding China because the United States proposed it. I think it should have voted for it because the expulsion of Formosa or Taiwan was a cruel act, and one for which the government of Canada had no mandate from the people. If I were not limited to 30 minutes I could produce chapter and verse right up to the eve of polling on that matter in 1968.

I will not take the time to refer to many of these statements made at the United Nations, in this chamber and in other chambers as well as to the Canadian people to indicate, when the appropriate time came, the callous and cruel abandonment by this government of its own position in reference to the universality of U.N. membership. In the process, we indulged in cold compression upon any possible effort in the foreseeable future by the Formosan people to work out for themselves a new degree of self-determination and eventual recognition by and admission to that world body. If the people across the way are proud of that, let them say so, but I do not think it is anything of which Canada should be proud.

Nor do I find that my high regard for the United States as a great neighbour and as a great nation prevents me or should prevent any other Canadian from deploring and decrying its president's decision to go ahead, against so much social and scientific opinion in his own country and others, with the Amchitka test. This has been discussed before. I am no more enthusiastic about his doing it than I am about the French doing it or the other two powers who tell us after they have done it, that is the Chinese and the Soviet Union.

A good neighbour policy does not require acquiescence from a smaller neighbour. Solidarity does not require eternal and constant uniformity of opinion on every given issue, but realism dictates that no government in Canada should recklessly engage upon a rampage of anti-Americanism without being prepared to face some painful consequences. Not that the United States will or should indulge in retaliation for our seeming recalcitrance, but because our relations are so close, our ties so intimate, our interdependence so great we require a special relationship. We require a continuing capacity to speak in a special way to retain that special relationship. It is the loss of this good understanding that worries me today and which worries the people of this country.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macquarrie: I care not how often the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) goes to Moscow, to Peking, to Belgrade, to