

showing how one can manufacture dynamite bombs and Molotov cocktails. There are instructions on how to organize. A pamphlet also points out that it is a very good idea to obtain instruction from Cuba. The fraternal relations existing between the revolutionaries of America are given full consideration. A pamphlet says that from now on, all members of the militant Quebec Left, that is the FLQ, may be classed as "professional revolutionaries".

Well, Sir, I have read enough to indicate that the Government of Canada, the present government, was remiss in its duties. It had the Criminal Code; it could have proceeded against these people for sedition, but no action was indeed taken. Furthermore, the press fully summarized the text of Mr. Saulnier's letter, which reads in part:

The partial revelations to which I will limit myself today are but a small example of things I know and of which I have privately informed the Prime Minister of Canada a few times in the past year.

That statement is dated October 13, 1969. It was further pointed that in the ranks of the Company of Young Canadians there was one member who had previously been convicted for terrorist activities. I could keep reading to the House. In other words, when the Government of Canada was furnished this information by the City of Montreal, all it did was close its eyes, shut its ears, and do nothing.

Mr. McIlraith: That is not right.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is that not right? I will let the hon. gentleman explain, because I will be very glad to hear what prosecutions are taking place and why those people who were picked up this morning, who have been guilty of sedition over and over again, were not proceeded against.

Mr. Sharp: There are 23 men in jail. What about the 23 in jail?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well now, so far as the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is concerned, let me say this to him: his responsibility was for the safety of all diplomats in Canada.

Mr. Sharp: I hope the right hon. member supports that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He knew that there was a danger of their being kidnapped—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and he did not act.

Mr. Sharp: Why did the right hon. gentleman not help us, then?

Mr. Diefenbaker: He did not act.

Le Petit Journal written by Gerard Asselin, on October 8, 1970, reads:

At the end of last spring, Le Petit Journal announced that it is expected that a foreign diplomat would be kidnapped in Canada by the terrorists.

Invoking of War Measures Act

—the actual FLQ is the follow up of the first well structured movement, that of Pierre Paul Geoffroy.

Mr. Drury: Did the right hon. gentleman ever hear of Burgess?

Mr. Diefenbaker: What did the Government of Canada do? It played around. It refused to offer a reward. The offer of a reward of \$50,000 in the spring brought this result: four of these criminals were picked up. In their list of conditions to the Government of Canada, the FLQ asks for the name of the person who revealed their identities. That is one of their requisites. The government contends that the name cannot be permitted to be revealed, and naturally so. The government ought to have offered a reward, as a result of its past experience with the FLQ. The fact that information was secured immediately after the reward was offered would indicate that when a person has no money in his pocket and no principle in his head, a reward always has a softening influence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: And what did the Secretary of State for External Affairs do?

Mr. Gibson: He did lots of hard work.

Some hon. Members: Hoot, hoot, hoot.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I always like the interruptions of my hon. friend from Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson). He reminds me of something that happened in the British House of Commons. There someone said, while talking about Mrs. Margot Asquith, that there is no finer political love match in all history, no greater love match, than that exemplified in the marriage between Margot and Asquith. The same applies to the hon. gentleman. There is no finer match than that between Gibson and Hamilton-Wentworth.

Some hon. Members: Hoot, hoot, hoot.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have great affection for the hon. member and love his interruptions. I hope he continues them.

What did the government do? It played around and then pretended that the burden was on the government of the province of Quebec. Premier Bourassa has acted with directness. He has spoken with authority and responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: And what did the Government of Canada do? Being responsible for the safety of diplomats, it said to the province of Quebec in effect, "This is your baby." All through the statement the Prime Minister has made runs this golden thread of uncertainty. The premier of the province of Quebec asked for action. Why did the Government of Canada abdicate to the government of the province of Quebec the responsibility for ascertaining what had happened to this unfortunate diplomat. I repeat