

U.S.S.R.-Canada Protocol
GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—REFUSAL OF GOVERNMENT TO
 HAVE U.S.S.R.-CANADA PROTOCOL CONSIDERED BY
 HOUSE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough) moved:

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

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have accepted the invitation of the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp) which was delivered yesterday to devote an opposition day to the discussion of the Soviet-Canada protocol. I can tell him that we did not choose this topic because there was any shortage of items on which we could criticize the present government. Indeed, the shelf which contains our potential and future motions of criticism is larger than that which contains the white papers, task forces and letters of resignation from the present government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: So, Mr. Speaker, we are not short of topics. Although, Sir, we are bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and glad to do so in the performance of our duty, we should not be the ones to do this. The government itself should have brought this matter to this chamber. It should have brought to this House for discussion this very important document, as it has described it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: Time was when we had foreign policy debates in this place initiated by a government; now, however, in the age of participatory democracy, such inhibitions as parliamentary discussions have been sloughed off. Press releases are much simpler and visits to distant lands with press entourages are obviously much more dashing and exciting. We have grown accustomed, not to innocents abroad but to professionals abroad. Perhaps it is considered valuable for Canada's Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to become the tourist of the year. Nor should we be critical if the Prime Minister desires to escape from time to time the troubles which his administration has visited upon this country. We have no quarrel with the glamorized publicity—kissing orang-outangs or sliding down banisters is all right with me. If this be descending charisma, so be it. Showmanship is fine but I become concerned when showmanship is taken for statesmanship. So I shall leave aside the frills, frivolities and furbelows of the Russian and other visits and try to examine such things and statements as might be considered serious and significant and beyond the range of the travelogue or public relations field. For such scrutiny there is at least one document which demands our attention, and that is the protocol referred to in the motion now under discussion.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (12:20 p.m.)

This protocol was signed on May 19 after the Prime Minister's first full day in Russia. One might describe it as almost "instant diplomacy", or was it an item held in freeze from last October when it was thought that a visit to the Soviet Union would be made? According to *Time* magazine of May 24, and this is a journal not unloved by the government:

Such are the formalities surrounding an official visit to Russia that the communiqué summing up the full and frank discussions between Trudeau and Kosygin was, in fact, drafted before Trudeau even left Ottawa.

This interesting revelation is to be found at pages 4 and 5 of the latest issue of *Time* magazine. We received it today so *Time* must have had this information much earlier, and that is not surprising. In the light of this revelation, the narrowly prosaic or frugal might ask in the wartime expression "was this trip really necessary?"

The protocol document was signed with much fanfare and many press statements, but without such mundane things as consultation with or reference to the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian people. We are told that because it was a protocol such inhibiting developments as Parliamentary discussion need not be forthcoming. This is a matter which requires examination, but not much examination before one comes to the conclusion that the naming of this particular testament as a protocol does not by any means avoid the requirement and the propriety that it be discussed in this place and before the Canadian people. Whatever the name used, whether it be called a treaty, an agreement or a protocol, the intent and effects of documents of this kind may be far-reaching for both countries and should have been discussed in Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: Going back to 1926, Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King—at times I think he still lives—moved a resolution which set out the procedure governing the negotiation, signature and notification of international agreements and treaties. He stated that:

—before His Majesty's Canadian ministers—

That is now an archaism!

—advise notification of a treaty or convention affecting Canada or signing acceptance of any treaty convention or agreement involving military or economic sanctions, the approval of the Parliament of Canada should be secured.

That is to be found in *Hansard* at page 4759 for the year 1926. It refers to a treaty or a convention affecting Canada. Now, we move on past the day of Mackenzie King and come to some of the luminaries of our governmental services. One of these is Mr. A. E. Gotlieb, a well-known international affairs expert and one of our best international lawyers who, in his book "Canada Treaty-Making" at pages 16 and 17 stated:

A study of Canadian precedents over the years tends to confirm that governments of the day have, as a general rule, considered that the important categories of treaties for which parliamentary approval should be sought prior to ratification fall roughly into four general groups involving:

(1) Military or economic sanctions;