

U.S.S.R.-Canada Protocol

ment put those brains to work on a problem of that kind instead of using them on these various Cook's tours.

There is also the whole question of the situation in the middle east and the terrible need by all parties in that area, the people of Israel, the Arabs and the refugees who are lost in between, to gain the confidence of countries like Canada and other countries in the world. Let us put our efforts into that. There are plenty of solid questions which call for solution and it is these things about which the government should be concerned. I wish the hon. member for Hillsborough had been himself today and put down as an external affairs motion one calling upon the government to pay attention to the real and solid problems.

I turn, now, to some observations I have been saving until the end of my remarks in case the Prime Minister came in. Of course, if he did come in there would be such a round of desk-pounding that I should probably not be heard. If the right hon. gentleman wants to express the view that there is too much domination of this country by the United States, I would agree with him. However, I think the place to say so is here or in the United States rather than in the Soviet Union. Now that he has broken the ice and has said it I hope he will say it back here as well as in the United States if on his next foreign visit he goes to that country.

I also wish to complain about some of the indiscreet statements the Prime Minister made while he was in the Soviet Union. If he made a statement in Kiev that the government of this country was like the government of the Soviet Union, I suggest this was not only an offence to many Ukrainians in this country, but an offence to us. It may be the Prime Minister is trying to make the government of this country like the government of the Soviet Union—perhaps that has just leaked out—but in any case I suggest it was an indiscreet statement.

If the Prime Minister comes in this afternoon he will get the floor. There will be lots of applause. He will get the press on today's debate and nothing anybody else says will be heeded at all. But I hope he will give us not just a travelogue, not just reminiscences of how delightful it was to be at the Bolshoi or at Samarkand. I hope he will tell us about some of the real, solid issues he discussed with Chairman Kosygin. I hope he will tell us that he is now prepared to give this country leadership in tackling some of the real problems which have to be solved if our world is to be held together.

[Translation.]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to make a few remarks on the motion moved this afternoon by the Progressive Conservative party, and which reads as follows:

That this House regrets the refusal of the government to bring before the House for consideration and decision the USSR-Canada protocol in order that all aspects of this relationship can be considered before implementation.

Mr. Speaker, this famous protocol had not caught my attention in any particular way, because knowing the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), I was aware that in the

course of his journeys to India and the USSR, he would tend to sign all kinds of papers and agree to all sorts of things which may not have any great substance, just through tactfulness. This is somehow the impression I had gathered from this protocol.

• (2:30 p.m.)

But upon considering the motion thereon, I realize that the Progressive Conservative party may have given too much importance to the protocol unless the responsibility lies with the press. Indeed, with this government you always come to learn of the ministers' statements through the press which often says a few words too many.

The May 20 edition of Ottawa's *Le Droit* mentions a new Soviet-Canadian agreement. They should have written "protocol on consultations" and not a formal agreement on principle as the one signed with Red China. In my view, it is merely an arrangement providing for consultations on the best way to live together as good neighbours. We cannot ignore the fact that we are living between two giants—the Soviet and the American. The question is: Who will be the first to swallow us?

Being a small country, I think we should better go at it intelligently. From what I read in *Le Droit* it would seem that consultative meetings will take place frequently. The article goes on to pinpoint the objectives of the protocol, and I quote:

The protocol of agreement provides—

—well, I do not like the word "agreement" here—

—for close co-operation between our two countries in areas such as pollution control in the Arctic, northern development, science, technology and culture.

Both governments would now proceed to rapid exchanges of views in case of a world crisis, to see what could be done to improve the situation. As regular contacts are foreseen, the agreement states that the Foreign Affairs ministers or their representatives will meet if need be and, in principle, once a year.

Further on one can read the following:

Although the Soviets had dismissed the idea of their eventually participating in an international conference on Arctic pollution, put forward by Mr. Trudeau, it is believed the Canadian Prime Minister let Mr. Kosygin know that the Ottawa government had appreciated the Kremlin's understanding attitude last year when Canada unilaterally decided to control water pollution 100 miles off the Arctic archipelago.

The Soviet attitude in this respect is that Canada and the USSR obviously have in that part of the world responsibilities and special rights other countries should recognize.

Mr. Speaker, if a group of Canadians and the Department of External Affairs are able to influence in any way the Soviet government, in trying to enter into certain friendly agreements, in short, if the government could succeed in establishing a genuine dialogue with the Soviet Union, a further step toward world peace would have been accomplished. However, I rather doubt it will succeed because considering the Russian government attitude toward all the countries which placed confidence in it we can rightly doubt its sincerity.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]