

*Supply—External Affairs*

me, because about two years ago I had the pleasure of raising that question in a speech in this chamber, and the developments that have taken place since have, I think, confirmed what I had to say at that time. I have heard today and on other occasions in this house what I consider to be a very sound approach to this whole problem with which we are faced in respect of the Soviet union and its influence on Europe and on the world. I believe that as long as this nation and other nations of what we call the democratic west stand firmly for the principles of freedom, democracy and self-determination, much of the smokescreen of propaganda that comes out of the Kremlin will in time clear away, and the people will be able to see clearly that these nations are the ones to look to if we are going to make any progress toward peace.

During the course of this debate and on previous occasions various party leaders have made statements with regard to the principle of self-determination. Only this afternoon the hon. member for Fraser Valley quoted in part a speech that was delivered by his leader in the city of Winnipeg a few weeks ago. On other occasions the Leader of the Opposition has placed statements on the record, and I think it is only fair that I should at this time place on the record part of the statement of my own leader having to do with that particular matter. It was on the same occasion as that referred to by the hon. member for Fraser Valley, and I have the honour of reading that statement to the Canadian congress which took place in the city of Winnipeg on July 7. This is in relation to this whole question of self-determination of nations. In part the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said:

We are in full support of the principles underlying the United Nations—an organization in which I played my part as a Canadian delegate in San Francisco in 1945. We are fully in support of the principles set forth in the Atlantic charter, which acknowledges the right to freedom and self-determination for all the nations of the world.

We are, therefore, in full sympathy with the desire of the Ukrainian people to achieve freedom and sovereignty for their nation and for the enjoyment of a progressive, democratic society which could live in peace with the other freedom-loving nations of the world.

I place that on record so it may be alongside the other statements that were made today.

In a general way, I must say that I agreed with the statement made by the minister this morning, but he did make one statement which I think should not be left on the record without comment at this time. He may not have meant to leave that impression, but at any rate the impression I received was not a good one. It was in connection with some

[Mr. Zaplitny.]

of the difficulties arising out of relations with the Soviet union. This is only part of the sentence as I wrote it down, and the full sentence will appear on the record, but he referred to the "Slavic tradition of autocratic rule". I understand the minister is a historian in his own right and he is, of course, a diplomat of high note in this world, but I think that on reflection he will realize that that is a generalization which is not only historically inaccurate but from a diplomatic point of view rather dangerous.

When I heard that statement I took the trouble to look up the Encyclopaedia Britannica in order to establish in my mind just what the word "Slav" refers to. I find that the people or race referred to as Slavs are certainly not confined within the borders of the Soviet union, to begin with, and, second, that not all the people confined within the borders of the Soviet union are of Slavic origin. If the minister will take a look at page 789 of the Encyclopaedia Britannica he will find that there are actually three different groups of what are known generally as Slavs. There is the eastern group, which takes in the Russians and Finns. There is the northwestern group, which includes Poles, what were known in the old days as Ruthenians and later as Ukrainians, and Moravians and certain other smaller groups; as a matter of fact, that group runs right into central Germany. Then there is the southern group, including Serbo-Croats, Bulgarians, Roumanians and people from the Balkan peninsula generally, going into southern Hungary and as far as Albania.

I mention this because I think it is always a danger to generalize. To speak of the tradition of autocratic rule of the Slavs is, I think, to overlook a great deal of history. I should like to refer the minister to what was said by William Henry Chamberlin, who was a correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor* in the Soviet union for a period of about 12 years, I believe, from 1922 on. Certainly he would have had a very fair opportunity to acquaint himself with these so-called Slavs to whom the minister referred. If you look at page 6 of this book called "The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation", you will find this paragraph:

One of the finest traits in the Ukrainian national character, a trait that is commemorated in some of the most powerful verses of Shevchenko, is the love of liberty. The Ukrainian heroes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the Kozaks, the warrior frontiersmen who fled from the yoke of Polish squire or Russian landlord and founded their wild, free military community "beyond the rapids", on the lower Dnieper. They went on expeditions, half-crusading, half-marauding, against Turks and Tartars, liberating large numbers of Christians who were held in slavery. They were unwilling to bow to any despotic