

with the object of securing economic and technological advantage for the U.S.S.R., while undermining the belief of the West to improve military defences. Every effort will be continued to weaken and break up NATO by bringing about the reduction of United States troops and commitments in Europe and eventually their withdrawal.

The fourth phase is to usher in a period of "Global Democratic Peace" in the late 1980s. A "progressive peace-loving" administration will come into power in the United States. By this time the United States will be isolated from Europe, and will be vulnerable to economic pressures. The Warsaw Pact will intensify the arms race, and will thus achieve an overwhelming superiority for the communist forces.

General Sejna states:

There is, of course, nothing especially sinister in any of this—nor anything very new to the student of Marxism-Leninism. It is no more than the brutal reality of international power politics... every action of the Soviet Union in the international field continues to be consistent with the tactics of the plan.

When toasts were proposed in Helsinki during Brezhnev's hour of triumph, General Sejna wanted the leaders of the West to remember the words of the Soviet party boss, the author of the plan, when he spoke to Eastern European leaders in Praha in February of 1968, after the appointment of Alexander Dubcek as First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. At that time, Leonid Brezhnev said:

If we want to win we cannot achieve our goals without strong military forces. Did we ever say that we would not use force if it was necessary to support progressive movements in, for example, France, Britain or Sweden?... This is the sacred duty of our forces—to protect and support progressive movements.

Can this be interpreted as non-interference in the internal affairs of foreign countries? Certainly not.

The press in the Western world was generally sceptical about the Helsinki accord, and there were numerous editorials which outrightly condemned the signing. The Estonian Information Centre of Toronto last November issued a volume—I have it here—entitled *The Summit Session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe held in Helsinki, Finland on July 28, 1975*. It is a collection of 111 articles from newspapers and periodicals, many by outstanding authorities, that appeared in the *New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, *Le Monde*, *Newsweek*, *National Review*, *The Times*, *The Economist*, *Peking Review*, and in many Canadian dailies such as the *The Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Star*, the *Toronto Sun*, the *Montreal Star*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, the *Ottawa Journal*, the *Winnipeg Tribune*, *Le Devoir*, and others.

Many outstanding authorities were highly critical of the CSCE, warning that most of the advantages were on the side of the Soviet bloc. The great Russian writer Solzhenitsyn, and the leader of the human rights movement in the U.S.S.R., Andrei Sakharov, advised against the declaration. The Soviet historian Edward Crankshaw, of Britain; George M. Ball, former American Under Secretary of State under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; Canadian historian James Eayres; the former Prime Minister of Canada,

[Senator Yuzyk.]

John G. Diefenbaker; Soviet expert Mark Gayn; and many other prominent authorities and leaders spoke out against sanctifying Soviet tyranny.

The Canadian Committee of Captive European Nations, composed of representatives of peoples that were subjugated by the U.S.S.R., urged the Canadian government not to sign the agreement, and gave evidence that the Helsinki "pact" was a sell-out of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

How does the great communist rival, the People's Republic of China, assess the Final Act of the CSCE? It should be remembered that the Soviet Union is vying to win Western sympathy, and even technological and economic support, in the event of a possible all-out war with Red China. Here is an excerpt from the *Peking Review* of August 8, 1975.

Time-consuming as it was, the conference did precious little more than to end up with a reiteration of the principles of the United Nations Charter. The documents and resolutions of the League of Nations before World War II likewise stipulated similar principles, but they could not prevent the outbreak of another world war. The U.N. Charter is now 30 years old, but since when has there been tranquillity on earth? Take the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet social-imperialists as an example. Could this move be in keeping with any of the aforesaid ten principles? But even in the course of the CSCE talks, officials of the Soviet delegation actually let it be publicly known that the dispatch of Soviet troops to occupy Czechoslovakia was not use of force and Moscow would do so again if and when a similar situation arose in the future. It is crystal clear that "international agreements" such as the so-called "principles guiding relations between states" have no binding force on Soviet social-imperialism as a mere scrap of paper and can in no way safeguard the security of the European countries.

Then comes the conclusion:

But above all it suits the Soviet Union and the United States, it dovetails into their contention for hegemony in Europe and the world and it serves their mounting rivalry. It has nothing to do with the safeguarding of security in Europe.

That is the official stance of the People's Republic of China.

● (1500)

If there are some who think that the U.S.S.R. will honour its pledges regarding human rights, I wish to draw their attention to a petition that was signed by 86 members of the Senate and the House of Commons on December 3, 1975. It was addressed to Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and sent to the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, with the following text:

We, the undersigned Canadian Members of Parliament, urgently appeal to the Soviet Government, in the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement, to permit the distinguished scientist Andrei Sakharov to go to Oslo to receive the deserved Nobel Peace Prize.

A reply was received on December 8 from the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa addressed to Mr. Alistair Fraser, Clerk of the House of Commons, returning the petition "in con-