

*Public Order Act, 1970*

**Mr. Alexander:** I wish the hon. member who has the floor would tell us what his party intends to do.

**Mr. Rose:** I am pleased that the hon. member for Edmonton Centre, who fell between two stools, was kind enough to identify himself just now.

**An hon. Member:** Surely, he would not fall between two stools.

**Mr. Rose:** I suggest to the hon. member for Edmonton centre in all sincerity that we are all big enough to tolerate having some fun poked at us once in a while. I am sorry that, despite all his fine words, despite all his fine arguments and despite his real and sincere concern, the Leader of the Opposition stated publicly, before the House had embarked very far on the third reading debate, that he would support the government on Bill C-181. I feel sorry, because I feel he has closed off his options. Because the minister knew that he could count on the support of a substantial portion of the House, he was probably less willing to accept amendments on third reading. In other words, I feel that the options of the party headed by the Leader of the Opposition have been closed in this way. I think the minister certainly would have been more convinced by the kind of sincerity expressed by people such as the Conservative justice critic from Calgary North if he had not been absolutely and positively assured of support on third reading.

I feel, too, that many members of the hon. gentleman's party will vote in favour of the bill on third reading, regardless of their particular convictions on it, because they will legally want to follow their leader. I regret that they have been put in this position.

**Mr. Alexander:** Do not go too far, now.

**Mr. Rose:** I say this in all sincerity. Many rumours have come out of the rumour mill that the FLQ has infiltrated into various agencies of government and various institutions. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) told us in the House that we have no idea of the extent of such infiltration.

**Mr. Peters:** Neither has he.

**Mr. Rose:** I ask, what federal agencies have been infiltrated by the FLQ?

**An hon. Member:** The government cannot answer that.

**An hon. Member:** The CYC was.

**Mr. Rose:** What does the government plan to do about this alleged infiltration? How many federal employees have been fired because it is alleged they infiltrated from the FLQ? Or is all this talk really scuttlebutt and part of the general picture of crisis that the government has been attempting to portray for the past month? How bad is the situation? Let the government come clean and tell us. In the meantime what we are debating at present is a motion that may lead to the establishment of a review board.

[Mr. Paproski.]

May I conclude by saying that I support such a concept. Many other Canadians support it. I think the House ought to try to establish something to meet this need.

**Mr. Hogarth:** Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Can he tell me of any instance in which the criminal law is administered by the federal government in a province without the consent of the attorney general of that province?

**Mr. Alexander:** Take that question as notice.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to look into that matter for the hon. member and have a reply as soon as possible.

**Mr. Alexander:** That is the sort of answer they give us all the time.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** The hon. member sounded just like a Parliamentary Secretary.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I had been hoping that perhaps the debate on this amendment might be concluded rapidly and that we could vote on it. I see that a number of hon. members are ready to speak on it. I shall, therefore, make a few remarks at this time and give the House my reasons for supporting this amendment which seeks to establish a review procedure applicable to those people who would be held under this bill. This is the first and last time I shall speak on this bill, and I should like to give a brief background of the reasons that led me to my conclusions.

The national pride of Canadians has been severely hurt by recent events. We had always felt that we are above and free from those ills that have beset others, particularly ills such as political kidnapping and assassination. As a result, the majority of Canadians reacted angrily and violently to the recent outrages. They are prepared to support almost any measures that look as if they will prevent this sort of thing from recurring. I believe it is only because Canadians are in this state at this time that they and their government would consider the introduction of a piece of repressive legislation of this kind, without including in it at least the power of reviewing the situation of people who may be thrown into jail without charge, without warrant, and on the mere whim of the police. This, certainly, is not a situation of which we can be proud. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy, as many have assumed, to arouse our anger. We in this Parliament must not continue to act out of the sense of anger and shame that currently fills our country. We cannot react in the savage or violent way that individuals are free to do. We are charged with responsibility for the future.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Over the years the state has had to take the long view. It has had to avoid meeting violence with violence and has had to administer justice in the knowledge that the