

Speech from the Throne

That is where the truth gets out. This force that has been set up is investigating. It is a force away from the RCMP, and among other things it is supposed to look into political matters. When one thinks how that murderer was given such fine attention that he was able to escape from the penitentiary, one wonders whether that comes under the heading of a much wider spirit which is included in the phrase "social, economic and political factors."

The Prime Minister said it is not true. He said the big lie shocks him. If he were here today, I would deal with that question at length. The truth is that every person in this country who has looked at the new RCMP badge knows that the designation "Royal Canadian Mounted Police" is out, excepting for the coat of arms. And the reason given is that the people, when they are looking for the police, do not know what RCMP means. That is what the Prime Minister said the other day. He said, "It is false. We have not done anything."

I have here a picture from the *Toronto Star*, Mr. Speaker. I cannot put it on the *Hansard* record; I wish I could. It shows the Solicitor General looking at a sign. This is the sign with the Coat of Arms and "Police." There is nothing else. What is being done in this case is undermining the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and then the government explains it by saying the Royal Canadian Mounted Police thought they would like the change made. Can the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police say that? A few months ago he pointed out that if an embassy were opened in Ottawa by China, it would be a breeding place for agitators. He was immediately told, "Shut your mouth and never talk again." Yet now, these same people come along and, to exculpate themselves with respect to the dastardly deed that has been committed, they say, "After all, the Mounted Police wanted it done."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I must interrupt the right hon. member, the time allotted to him having expired, unless he gets the unanimous consent of the House to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House give unanimous consent to the right hon. member to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now, Sir, I will move away from Canada to the international field, but only for a short time. I do not think I have ever known my country to be lower in prestige internationally than it is today. The statement by the Prime Minister that we feared the United States militarily was one that shocked the sensibilities not only of Americans but of free men everywhere in the world.

Then, there was the other statement made by the Prime Minister when he was asked by Ukrainian Canadians, and Ukrainians from other parts of the world, to bring to the attention of the Soviet authorities what was taking place today, not only in the Ukraine but throughout the captive nations of the world. Kosygin, when he was here, said he loved peace. How he must have laughed when he said that. Today Brezhnev and Kosygin are reviving the Stali-

nist repression that seemed to end with the elevation of Khrushchev to authority.

In the case of the Ukrainian people, 11 of their leaders have been arrested, not because of their advocacy of revolution but because they have been critical of the Soviet government's failure to live up to its pledged principles in the United Nations. There is a new wave of Russian persecutions against Ukrainians. The intellectuals who speak out are accused of dealing in anti-Soviet propaganda. The Soviet courts are applying a new rule and imposing additional sentences for acts allegedly committed against Soviet society while an accused is in prison. I can give example after example. One is Valentyn Moroz, a young Hungarian historian, who was sentenced in 1970 to nine years of hard labour for writing a report about Beria Reserve while serving a previous sentence of four years in that prison camp. I have the list here of free men, many of them communists, who are being put in jail without trial.

The World Congress of Free Ukrainians wishes to have this matter fully investigated. I intend to do what I can in that connection, it having honoured me by naming me as the national chairman. I will do what I can to assure those who love freedom, as we love freedom, in the Ukraine and in the Baltic countries of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia, and in other countries that are under communist domination, that what is wrong will be revealed.

People ask where does the Prime Minister come in on this? I do not want to quote at length, but I will quote what he said when he was asked by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) what he was going to do about it, and what he had done. As reported on May 31 he said he had little sympathy with nationalists in Canada or the Soviet Union. He said:

I quite frankly avoided talking about that. I tried to get some data which would permit me to talk about it on a basis on which I felt really involved and convinced, and—quite frankly—couldn't take up the causes, several of which were put to me, that I should protest in favour of so-and-so and so-and-so who had been jailed because of their nationalistic beliefs.

My position in the Soviet Union or in Canada is that anyone who breaks the law to assert his nationalism does not get too much sympathy from me.

In 1958, he said that everyone had the right to oppose any law if he did not agree with it.

Again, according to the report on May 31, he said:

I didn't particularly feel like bringing up any cases which would have caused Mr. Brezhnev or Mr. Kosygin to say: 'Well you know, why did you put in jail certain FLQ leaders? After all they think they are only fighting for the independence of Quebec. Our people say they are fighting for the independence of the Ukraine. Why should you put your revolutionaries in jail and we shouldn't put ours?'

• (1520)

That statement was an insult to every Canadian of Ukrainian origin and to every other Canadian.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is equating the murderers and kid-nappers with intellectuals who are simply advocating that the law be lived up to. Then, when the Prime Minister got into difficulty about that he said "I really didn't mean that". The same old equivocal course. Say the thing, have