

it ourselves". Therefore, if there was any chance of making any progress on this, it would be by making appeal on a humanitarian basis, and I explained to them that I had made such appeals on reunification of families which concern a great many Ukrainians; I had made such appeals on the emigration of Jews which concern a great many Soviet citizens; that members of my party, like Walter Deakon, had raised the particular question of imprisoned intellectuals, and so on, but that we were making these representations as a country which wanted to have good relations with the Soviet Union, as a country which had many Ukrainian and Jewish Canadians who felt strongly on these and we were hoping that they would concede these things, once again, not as a matter of right but as a matter of good relations with Canada.

Q. Do you still compare the Federal system of Canada with that of the Soviet Union and do you see Quebec in the same light as you see the Ukraine?

A. No to both questions. You know, many Quebecers want us to put in the Constitution the right of self-determination; I shouldn't say many, but some Quebecers, which is...

Q. But the Ukraine is in the United Nations at the moment.

A. Yes, so what are you arguing, that the Ukraine is more independent from Moscow than Quebec is from Ottawa?

Q. Yes.

A. Well you don't know much about the Communist Party and the way that...

Q. (Inaudible)

A. Well, yes, of course it's in the Constitution that the Ukraine can exercise its right to self-determination. Why don't they?

Q. It's the same thing as Czechoslovakia—the Brezhnev doctrine.

A. Well, exactly. So the comparison is not right because the political apparatus in the Soviet Union can hold the country together even if the Constitution says it might fall apart. There is no comparison.

Q. Do you know who Valentin Moroz is now?

A. No, do you?

Q. Yes.

A. Good.

Well, what did all those remarkable remarks really mean? Was this an apology? For what? Apparently for "hurting people's feelings". It was certainly not an apology for making false comparisons and false statements, as was proven to him. Was this circumlocution and casuistry? Or was this one of Mr. Trudeau's fuddle-duddle exercises? Most leaders and people whom I have spoken to in Edmonton, Calgary, Yellowknife, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa stated that the

[Hon. Mr. Yuzyk.]

Prime Minister's clarification was evasion of the issues, and putting the blame on the press for misrepresentation.

The Globe and Mail editorial of June 9 entitled "Misinterpreted Again" tries to interpret the misinterpretation, and I quote:

One of the more intriguing—and often distressing characteristics of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau is what seems to be a complete inability to admit error. He may be misinterpreted, misquoted, misread, misunderstood, but never mistaken. The art of graceful retreat is one that he has yet to master.

Mr. Trudeau was recently very strongly criticized when he explained that he had avoided raising with Soviet leaders the question of jailed Ukrainian nationalists because this might have brought the rejoinder: "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."

It is understood, of course, that Mr. Trudeau was paraphrasing a hypothetical point that might have been raised by the Russian leaders—although it is curious that he should have considered himself vulnerable to such a proposition. The main point at issue, however, was Mr. Trudeau's comment—

And this is a quote from the statement.

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

In other words, he is not prepared to make distinctions. His sympathies are reserved for those who remain within the law, no matter whose law it is or what shade of justice it defines.

I am still quoting from this editorial.

Mr. Trudeau has told a delegation representing the Canadian Ukrainian Federation (Ukrainian Canadian Committee) he is sorry—sorry if their feelings had been hurt, that is. But, of course it was the fault of those ogres who are always out to make mischief.

And quoting Mr. Trudeau again:

"I was rather sure their feelings had been hurt by people who misrepresented what I said rather than what I said in fact... So on this ground, of course, I don't like to hurt people's feelings but of course I can't be blamed for people who twist my words."

And the last paragraph of the editorial—

What twisting? Which words? As we understand it, Mr. Trudeau made it plain enough that neither the Ukrainians nor the FLQ deserved his sympathy if they asserted their nationalism outside the law. Or are we still misrepresenting what he said?

If Prime Minister Trudeau does not want to recognize the grim facts evident under the Soviet totalitarian police regime, I am sure that we shall get nowhere by asking him to apologize for his apology. The people will be the judges of the justification of his stand.