

S.O. 30

action? For example, have we taken in meaningful terms such actions related to air travel that might be considered necessary to show the world's revulsion at the Soviet action?

This afternoon I raised a question on the Canadian-Soviet Protocol on Consultations which was signed by the then and present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on May 19, 1971 in Moscow. We note that various things were enshrined in that agreement which I can only feel that the Government today could call upon the Soviet Union to live up to and to perform. For example, in that agreement surely it is worth noting tonight that the Prime Minister of Canada and the Soviet leaders agreed to consultations embracing international questions including situations causing tension in various parts of the world. The protocol went on to indicate in clause 2:

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, the two Governments will make contact without delay in order to exchange views on what might be done to improve the situation.

Those are direct quotations from the protocol which was signed by our Prime Minister and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1971.

Surely we must consider what has been the Government's reaction to the Soviet envoy's response when we asked him to accept a note in Ottawa concerning the possible compensation for the survivors of the victims who were Canadians. Let me read into the record the news account of what was the Soviet response as reported in *The Toronto Star*:

The top Soviet diplomat in Canada touched off a diplomatic incident here yesterday when he furiously refused to accept a formal note from the Canadian government demanding compensation for the ten Canadian victims of the Korean airliner massacre.

It went on to indicate:

But he angrily refused to accept it in person from External Affairs' top legal adviser, Leonard Legault, and told him to mail it to the Soviet embassy.

Then he added: "I think you've got the wrong address on it anyway. You should send it to the U.S. government."

Then the veteran diplomat who is heading the Soviet mission in Canada until the new ambassador is appointed to succeed the former ambassador stormed off back to the fortress-like embassy. Is that not a startling contrast to the tone of the protocol signed in 1971 calling for immediate consultations between the Soviet Union and Canada if an event such as we are discussing tonight should ever occur? At that time let us remember what the then and present Prime Minister said concerning what he had done in Moscow.

● (2050)

At a press conference in Moscow at the time of the signing of that agreement, the Prime Minister, in talking of the need for Canada to diversify its relations because of the overpowering presence of the United States, stated:

—that is reflected in a growing consciousness amongst Canadians of the danger to our national identity from a cultural, economic and perhaps even military point of view.

Later in that press conference, the then and present Prime Minister said:

—if they can take time to discuss with us the various aspects of policy and various events in the world which might lead to threatening peace, we are very glad for that . . . What I do see is that if areas of tension arise that both parties will consult and both parties will take whatever means they can to reduce these tensions.

He concluded by saying:

I think the first thing that we tried to establish was an atmosphere of confidence, of trust.

In view of what has transpired, earlier today I asked the Prime Minister what he felt had occurred under that protocol. Has there been a violation in fact of the provisions of the agreement? I was rather taken back, and I invite all Members tomorrow to read *Hansard*, to hear what the Prime Minister said. He said there had been gestures on the part of the Government. To use his words, he said the Hon. Member will know that the then Acting Prime Minister, the Minister of State for External Relations, in the very first gesture of response by this Government asked the Charge d'Affaires precisely to embark upon consultations and to explain the circumstances of the tragic happening. The other gestures taken by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in dealing with Soviet authorities both here and in Moscow have precisely been doing that, asking for consultations, asking for explanations, asking for reparation, and taking some measures of our own.

I believe that the people of Canada demand more than gestures. They demand more than rhetoric. To date I would suggest that perhaps the Prime Minister only inadvertently, but so aptly used the word "gesture" in replying to questions in this House today.

Let me touch on perhaps the most vital part of this debate, that is our compassion, our sympathy for those who have lost, in the case of Canadians, ten of their family. It is only fitting that as the debate continues, instead of talking about numbers with vague references to people who have been victims that we read into the record the names of these ten who were shot down in cold blood as they proceeded on their trip. I refer of course to Marilou Covey, Toronto; Brother Jean-Paul Grégoire, Laval, Quebec; Mary Jane Hendrie, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; François Robert de Massy, Hampstead, Quebec; Georgis Panagopoulos, Toronto, Ontario; François Robert, Longueuil, Quebec; Larry Patrick Sayers, Stoney Creek, Ontario; Mrs. Chun Lan Yeh, Toronto, Ontario; Mao San Lim, Toronto, Ontario and Mrs. Chi Man Leung, Hamilton, Ontario.

In paying tribute to those people, perhaps it would be only fitting to read into the record one small quotation from Mary Jane Hendrie, one of the victims, written to a friend a brief time before her tragic "Flight into Darkness", as *Maclean's* has referred to it. At the time she wrote:

Count your blessings and overcome your hardships. That is what life is all about. The tragic sense of life is that people allow hardship to overwhelm them . . . But I think it is actually an effort to resist that darkness, when it is overwhelming, that is the beauty of human life—

Those were the words of one of the victims of this tragic shooting. As the debate continues I ask Hon. Members to