

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the question may be prompted by press reports that the Soviets did not accept our proposal at the United Nations. That is correct, although we did get a good deal of support for it during the debate, which I believe concluded yesterday. We will continue to pursue the matter there.

● (1152)

On the specific point of the collection of costs as they relate to the work of recovery of the satellite, we have submitted to the Soviet Union a further note which indicates quite categorically Canada's view that the Soviet Union is responsible and that it is our intention to seek to recover the funds that were expended in this regard. I may say that I would have no objection to tabling it—this may cut off a supplementary question—if that note is desired by members. I would be glad to do so.

#### REPORT ON SHCHARANSKY CASE

**Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It arises out of the motion which was made in the House and adopted unanimously, presented by the hon. member for York Centre and seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, to the effect that the Shcharansky case and the offer of landed immigrant status which Canada has extended to Shcharansky be raised at the earliest possible moment at the Belgrade meeting. I ask the minister if that has been done. Also, perhaps he could report to the House, if it has not been done, on the difficulties that might be encountered and what we can expect to be done in this regard.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the last word that I had from the delegation in Belgrade—by the way, it was a report which embraced some of the views of members of parliament and members of the other place who were there at the time—was that up to that moment there had not been an appropriate phase in the discussions at Belgrade which would permit the actual presentation of this resolution.

Our ambassador was looking for alternative means through which it could be done, and will advise us when he has reached the appropriate conclusion as to what the best technique would be. I think there are members of parliament and members of the other place in Belgrade who are following this as well, and I will be governed by the general conclusion. In other words, we will follow whatever conclusion the total delegation comes to as to the best way to proceed.

**Mr. Fraser:** The Secretary of State for External Affairs was not here yesterday—undoubtedly, he was engaged in other duties—but a motion was presented to the House by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, seconded by myself, which was also unanimously approved with respect to the Shcharansky case, directing the House to urge upon the Soviet Union that we have an observer at the trial, and also repeating

#### Oral Questions

the offer of the Canadian government to grant Mr. Shcharansky landed immigrant status. My question to the minister is whether he can tell the House, first of all, how soon this direction given by the House to him will be carried out, and when will we have a report on the action taken on this unanimous resolution?

**Mr. Jamieson:** I hope you will permit me a moment here, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate, in a completely non-argumentative way, the difficulty which these two motions present. I will answer by saying that of course they will be submitted at the earliest opportunity to representatives of the Soviet Union. However, I would point out with the best of intentions, I have no doubt the two are mutually exclusive unless we can find an effective way of putting them together.

One suggests that there should be an immediate release of Mr. Shcharansky; the other anticipates the trial of Mr. Shcharansky. This makes it extremely difficult for us to argue that the gentleman ought not to be tried and that we should continue with the initial course which we pursued, namely, of asking that he be released from the Soviet Union and that we will take him into custody. I make that point, I repeat, not in any debating sense but to illustrate the difficulties of debating these tremendously sensitive issues in public.

I will be glad to consult with hon. members opposite who have an interest in this case, and with members on this side of the House, in private or in any other way so we can reach a suitable approach to this matter which will illustrate that we all have a concern for this gentleman and for human rights in general, and so we can do it in a manner which will effectively advance our goals rather than being self-defeating which, regrettably and with the best of intentions, often turns out to be the case.

**Mr. Fraser:** I would like to ask the minister, again in a non-argumentative way, whether in view of his remarks he would give careful consideration to the representations that have been made to him, to members of his own party and to members of my party, which give a very strong indication that publicity in these areas is not self-defeating but, in fact, brings about—on certain occasions—some very positive results. Having said that, I recognize the difficulties to which the minister is referring, but I would ask him to consider—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps the subject is being overworked.

#### MINISTER'S DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIET OFFICIALS ON QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Defence: it is concerned with human rights. Last Wednesday evening, the Estonian Central Council, the Latvian National Federation in Canada, and the Lithuanian community met in Ottawa for the Balkan evening. Since the Minister of National Defence addressed this group, I wish to ask him—because some Estonian immigrants have settled in my constituency—in view of the