

- (2) large expenditures of public funds or important financial or economic implications;
- (3) political considerations of a far-reaching character.

Surely, if the words of the Acting Prime Minister are to be taken at face value, that this protocol is an historic and important agreement, it would fall clearly within the category set out in paragraph 3 of Professor Gotlieb's book. He is now the Deputy Minister of Communications. If this document, signed in the Soviet Union, is to be taken at face value it is surely one involving political considerations of a far-reaching character. I would say that regardless of the terminology and the designation by the press of this agreement between two countries, any measure into which Canada enters with one of the great powers of the world—the superstate of the Soviet Union—would have to be treated as a major move and should deserve the consideration of this Parliament.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** To do less with any agreement or negotiation with one of the great powers of the world is clearly a contempt of Parliament or a denigration of the importance of the document. So to find out, since the document was not put before us, we have to go to that usual source, the lyrical Lynch of the Southam chain, and his associates who have been following the Prime Minister from south to north and from east to west during his latest tour. We must turn to them for information and evaluation, and God knows that is a hazardous enough undertaking for any of us. There have been fullsome and sometimes fanciful reports of what went on, and efforts at judgment and description which, if nothing else, are interesting and readable. Some see the Russian trip as a new bridge of understanding, and some regard it as a buttress to Canadian independence from the United States. I say that this suggestion is unworthy, if not contemptible.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** The United States is not above reproach but anyone, especially in the Soviet Union, who reflects upon the state of the borders with that country and its neighbouring states, and reflects upon the many generations of our peaceful, open border with the United States and makes the suggestion that it is necessary to call in the Soviet Union to sustain us from the pressure of the economy, culture and military—I use the word "military" as it was used in the report from which I read—is again making a contemptible, unworthy, improper and totally unrealistic statement.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** As I said, the lyrical Lynch saw the Prime Minister calling in the old world to redress the imbalance of the new, recalling the great George Caning. Charles Lynch also said of the protocol:

That may be one way of saying that Canada can have Washington's cake and eat Moscow's caviar, with Peking's duck as a main course.

#### U.S.S.R.—Canada Protocol

To this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I reply, that is quite a meal if you can get it.

**Mr. Crouse:** All we have is a goose.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** How significant in the field of international affairs is the protocol? What does it mean to public relations between the two signatories and other states which have important international commitments? It is in this area we face a great problem. Is this grandstanding, is it window-dressing, or is it something else again? I looked for some quotation from the Prime Minister and I came up with something very reminiscent of Humpty Dumpty, as quoted in the *Globe and Mail* of March 21:

But Mr. Trudeau himself said that the protocol will be what the two countries choose to make of it.

• (12:30 p.m.)

But what do we mean? Is this another development on the international scene of the famous grandstanding techniques which were so long successful in this country domestically? Is it another case like the great Commonwealth initiative which was to have saved the Commonwealth at the Singapore meeting, but which was in ashes and ruin almost before the Prime Minister returned to Canada to read his own press releases concerning how well he had done.

**An hon. Member:** Read the paper and find out the truth.

**An hon. Member:** Or make your own speech.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** Or is this something fundamental? Is this an important and historic agreement? I say if it is it is outrageous that it should be entered into through the back door, through secrecy and without reference to the Canadian people or before discussion in Parliament.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** If this is important, if this is a watershed, if this is a great triumph in touristic statesmanship, then it has been very badly handled. The people should be consulted. This government has not made many moves in the field of foreign affairs. Usually, it reveals the withdrawal syndrome reminiscent of the 1930's and Mackenzie King. In its few moves in the realm of foreign affairs, this government has been distinguished for its unilateralism. The dropping of the Commonwealth sugar rebate in the Caribbean is one example of this. But if this is an important document, it should not only have been preceded by consultations here or followed by consultations here but also with consultations with our allies who are very much involved.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** One is beginning to be concerned about the place of our friends of long standing and the priority of values in this government's foreign policy. One wonders why the head of the Canadian government,