

*Public Order Act, 1970*

We would thus give satisfaction to the people of Quebec and, at the same time, we would show a real sense of equity, thus ensuring harmony and justice. We will demonstrate our intent to reinforce Canadian unity not by speeches, as it has so often been the case, but by our actions. We cannot achieve Canadian unity by recriminating against each other at every opportunity.

What we say is plain enough for the government to understand our aims. The government enjoys an absolute majority in the House and it is thus in a position to give us what we are asking for. They cannot pass the responsibility of their refusal onto someone else. If the government, in its stubbornness, continues to restrict the scope of that legislation to the sole province of Quebec, their gesture will be assessed as it deserves by the coming generations for they will bear that mark forever. It is still time for them to change their line. If we have a Canadian government—or a government which pretends to be Canadian—let it pass legislation that will benefit all Canadians.

The government refused Quebec long enough the special status it has always asked. Now that we no longer want that special status because it is tainted with prejudice, this act is to be passed. Let the government beware of being deliberately stubborn and taking advantage of the absolute majority it owes the Canadian people and the province of Quebec. Precisely because it promised to achieve a just society, a united Canada, it should not now take advantage of its absolute majority to exercise it against the mandate the people gave it.

I trust the Minister of Justice is awake enough to understand what I am asking of him. Can he give me a specific answer on the problem I am explaining to him? If the government takes advantage of its absolute majority to turn a deaf ear, it will contribute further to feeding those elements of dissension amongst the people from which stems the very violence it wants to avoid through this act to provide emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada.

The government should understand that violence does not happen all at once. Violence can be cultivated and the means the government is using to fight it should not serve to give it new strength and new justifications. As far as we are concerned, we are serious and we claim only what we think is fair and reasonable under the circumstances. It is up to the government to decide.

We are facing at present two large ideologies, communism and capitalism. Communism, if pushed to excess, preaches the use of all means to dominate the universe one day. We do not want this system because the capitalist system is the best in the world. If we are unable, in our capitalist system, to find a solution to our problems, we will then fall under the yoke of an ideology which is complete opposite to ours.

If under the great communist ideology, three meals a day can be guaranteed to everybody, why can we not, under our capitalist system, guarantee the same thing, in freedom?

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Another very important reason justifies the application of this legislation to all of Canada, and not only to Quebec. This reason was given by the sponsor of the bill, the Minister of Justice.

On November 4, the minister made the following statement, as reported on page 883 of *Hansard*. I quote:

Our criminal law was unprepared, both in substance and procedure, both operationally and philosophically, to deal with the kind of terrorist activity and violence which we have witnessed in recent weeks.

It was not meant for a society wherein terror and violence suddenly became synchronized.

The criminal law, as we have it now, assumes that a crime is primarily an individual act or is committed by a single individual. Our criminal law is not equipped fundamentally to deal with organized group violence or organized terrorism.

This quite sensible statement of the Minister of Justice proves that we need legislation to deal with organized violence and terrorism. But is it only in the province of Quebec that we must be ready to deal with them?

If acts of terrorism and violence are committed in other provinces, we will not be ready to take the necessary steps to deal with them. Is that what we want?

This bill should keep its national scope. Indeed, it would be logical to be ready to fight terrorism everywhere if it became necessary. Why should we be ready only in Quebec and not in the other provinces? The hon. Minister of Justice will answer me, if he feels like it.

He himself regrets certain deficiencies as regards the criminal law. The minister wants to correct them for the province of Quebec while leaving them for the other provinces. Why should it be so? Why this distinction and this discrimination?

The same deeds perpetrated in the province of Quebec will come under the special legislation and not under the Criminal Code.

● (9:50 p.m.)

Has anybody given it any real thought?

Is the position of Minister of Justice created only for the Province of Quebec or for the whole of Canada? That is the question. That is the problem that must be solved immediately, or at least, before the special legislation is passed.

We are not separatists. We don't want to become separatists. Don't force us to turn to separatism. If the minister does not want it, neither do we.

The hon. Minister of Justice is perhaps being stubborn, after having received ample warning of his responsibility to 22 million Canadians, and not merely to 6,400,000 Quebecers. It is still time to avoid a monumental blunder. Will he be wise enough to seize the opportunity offered? Sometimes there is more dignity for a man in turning back than in persisting obstinately on a road which has been recognized to be the wrong one, even after starting on it.