

We are not talking about the relationship between Canada and Pago Pago, Uruguay, or some other distant country from which there is a small volume of annual traffic. There are tens of millions of visits between Canada and the United States by citizens of the two countries on an annual basis. Probably one-quarter of the population of Canada seeks to visit the United States at some point during the course of a year because we are good neighbours and good friends in many ways.

However, there are too many cases where Canadians have been blocked because they attended a conference which was deemed to be left wing, because as students they went to a peace conference sponsored by a Soviet-sponsored peace body, or because they associated with a group in Canada which was legitimate under Canadian law and had the right to free association in Canada but which the Americans considered for some reason to be subversive and not acceptable in their country.

This is the kind of thing which should not occur between two mature nations which seek to be friendly with each other in a reasonable and normal way. Since Canada does not reject people on these grounds, one has to assume that it is the United States which is immature in this particular case.

I am glad to know that Congress now has before it legislation which would repeal these offensive provisions of the McCarran Act. However, a person whose name has been put into a computer by American immigration because of the McCarran Act has to go through incredible amounts of red tape. I have approached the American Embassy here in Ottawa on behalf of constituents on this particular matter. I was subjected to bureaucratic baffle and stonewalling beyond belief. The Americans essentially say, "Oh, you know what Congress is like, we can't do anything about it. We're awfully sorry, we're terribly sympathetic, we can't help you, goodbye". I do not think that is good enough. The Government of Canada should have exercised the leverage it had in order to do away with an irritant which affects thousands of our citizens who would potentially go into the United States, which is quite unreasonable.

I know the problem is that the Government is uncritical with regard to actions and policies of the United States Government. That may be the reason it decided not to do anything in this particular area. We heard the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) say the other day, with regard to the tragic loss of life when an Iranian plane was shot down by an American missile, that as far as the Government was concerned it saw no reason to question the American account of the incident. Therefore, initially, the Government was not prepared to support requests which we and many other people, including the Iranians quite properly, were making for an impartial investigation into what took place there.

That same kind of credulity and perhaps naïvety seems to exist with respect to the trade agreement. I will not go too far in that direction or you might call me back to order. The point

Legal Assistance

I want to make is that while we are good friends, good neighbours, and extraordinarily important trading partners with the United States, and vice versa, at the same time Canadians too have interests with respect to the United States. We should be using every opportunity to promote those interests and ensure they are rolled over by American authorities. We also know that the Americans are too prone to do that.

• (1610)

The Corps of Engineers wants to open the taps and drain water from the Great Lakes. As far as they are concerned, it is a matter that could be approved by the Pentagon with no problem and Canadians should not be so presumptuous as to suggest that since we are affected by a lower water level of the Great Lakes, decisions on the Great Lakes should be made jointly rather than unilaterally.

I would also speak passionately about another unresolved matter. It is the failure of the Canadian Government to use every means possible to seek justice from the United States over the Canadian victims of brainwashing in Montreal which was sponsored and financed by the Central Intelligence Agency. That too is a legal question involving a mutual legal affair. In this case acts in Canada—

Mr. Friesen: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the Member would want to be a little more accurate. The victims in Montreal were in fact victims but, as I understand, not victims of brainwashing but as a result of the use of drugs that are found to be harmful. I think it is in error to say that it was brainwashing. It was medical treatment that was untried and should never have been used. They are victims, but I wish the Hon. Member would be accurate about that.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I would only suggest to the Hon. Member to heed his own advice and let us perhaps stay closer to the subject at hand so that we may be able to keep on with the debate.

Mr. Cassidy: Madam Speaker, I think the Hon. Member would agree that these were victims of experiments which were financed by the CIA and certainly related to brainwashing although they may or may not have involved the use of brainwashing.

The reason I raise these questions is that our country is being given authority, according to the Bill, to enter into pacts for mutual legal assistance with many other countries in the world. There is no assurance that where there are irritants or outstanding legal questions with those countries, we will undertake to sort out those questions at a point when we have leverage. It is in the mutual interest of both countries to have a treaty for mutual legal assistance.

The Bar Association was not happy about the rather broad powers granted under this Bill. We believe that the problems with the Bill are sufficiently serious to justify our view not to support it as it stands at third reading.