

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that this government is noted for its quiet diplomacy. I certainly agree with the quietness. As far as the diplomacy is concerned, it has been a government that has refused to stand internationally and nationally.

● (1552)

When I first brought before parliament the question of a bill of rights for Canadians, members of the government paid lip service to the objectives which I had in mind. Beyond that, nothing. It took years and years before any advance could be made. If there had not been a change of government in 1957, Canadians today would not enjoy the freedom which is inherent in the legislation passed by parliament in the Bill of Rights.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** They gave vocal support to the idea, and that was all. Mr. Speaker, I am not here for the purpose of advertising myself, but over the years—and I was at the bar scores of days every year—I never charged an Indian if he had a just case, and where there was injustice on the part of those of different racial origin inherent in what had taken place with regard to them, I took the case.

As far as the French language is concerned, it is sometimes forgotten that I had the largest support in the province of Quebec any Conservative leader had received since the days of Macdonald. It was on the basis of the stand I had taken in 1921. As a young lawyer I was asked whether I would take an appeal order which was made in the trial of two French Canadian trustees, Boutin and Ethier, who had been convicted of permitting the teaching of French beyond the extent contemplated by the law. Everybody knew my objective was parliament. My friends came to me and said, "If you take that case you can never hope to be in parliament." And they almost proved it. Four times in succession they proved it. The case of Boutin and Ethier is not a figment of my imagination, Mr. Speaker. It can be found in the law reports of 1921. I went ahead with the case and, as things turned out, the appeal was allowed. Since then, throughout the years, French Canadians in Western Canada have not forgotten that when they had no friends in the law to take their appeal it was a lawyer in the small town of Wellkum who did so. In other words, believing in freedom and the maintenance of those principles in the constitution without which Canada cannot survive, I took trial after trial when it was not popular to do so.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned parliament in a passing way. Mr. Speaker, this is no parliament such as I saw, first, in 1940 in the dark days of war. Mackenzie King was prime minister. It is of interest that my dad taught him in the primer.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I think my dad was the only person in Canada who asked Mackenzie King when he was prime minister, "What shall I call you now?" And he said, "Willie". But I

### *Human Rights*

want to tell you that the "Willie" did not apply to Willie's son—my father's first name was Willie. Mackenzie King insisted upon parliament being upheld. We didn't have cooling apparatus then. We had a slight attempt at it. And by this time, the latter part of May and the early days of June, when Mr. Mackenzie King had decided that parliament had sat long enough, even that cooling apparatus was turned down to nothing and the temperature was greatly added to. He knew how to act in order to achieve results.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I will make a note of that!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I am not passing this on to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen), because he is astute, I listened to his motion today and I was convinced that he has inherited some of Mr. King's unusual political acumen.

For some reason the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) seems to have an aversion to having consideration given by parliament to the diabolical cruelties which have been perpetrated and which are being perpetrated today on captive peoples in Europe.

Where do I get the affection I have for people of Ukrainian origin? It goes back to those early days on the homestead when we were surrounded by Ukrainians, Hungarians, Polish immigrants. I formed for them an affection which the years have not eradicated.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** You talk about international freedom. Well, I intend to give you some examples of that. In connection with the conference in 1975 to which the Leader of the Opposition has referred, the Helsinki conference, I wanted parliament to take a stand. Will parliament take a stand? So long as there is a Liberal government of the kind which exists today, regardless of injustice, whenever motions are moved under Standing Order 43 there are one or two members opposite who are, apparently, *personna designata*. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Lefebvre) is one of them, I think. He sits back there behind the whip of the Liberal party and in that squeaky voice says "No". And that ends the discussion. A gramophone record, I suggest to the whip of the Liberal party, would be more effective.

What I am saying is this: parliament has been emasculated. Look at the order paper. There are a thousand questions left unanswered. That is my estimate in round figures. Ask a question this government doesn't want to have answered, and it simply dies on the order paper regardless of whether the election is to be on October 26 or on some other occasion when the Prime Minister finally determines that the people should have the right to make known their views.

What about this Helsinki conference? I was a pariah. I said: This is all wrong. It means nothing. It is dangerous. It will enable the U.S.S.R. to surround by boundaries, gained as a result of conquest, freedom-loving people such as the Ukrainians and the Baltic peoples and others whose only crime is that they dare to believe in freedom.