

Mr. Lewis: He can just say it has happened.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is right.

Mr. Lewis: That is all he is saying.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is right.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The Chair is not aware of the conversation that took place between the two hon. members, so it might be a good time to remind them to address themselves to the Chair so that a decision can be made if it relates to the work of the House.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry you were not in on the exchange but I sat down and the Minister of Justice was kind enough to update me on some of the facts of this particular case and to admonish and warn me that I must not go too far here. I accept the warning. I really did not wish to comment on it but I think I could ask a question. What would have happened had this particular situation occurred with a common labourer, say an unemployed labourer from British Columbia who happened to be visiting Quebec City on his vacation?

I hear a comment from the wings to the effect what would have happened if the War Measures Act had been in effect? There was no apology. Since I understand this matter is before the courts, I shall not comment on it further except to say it is unfortunate that a British Columbia civil servant happened to have the bad luck to resemble a bank robber.

Mistakes can happen in spades with the normal powers of police. Some of us fear that with the special powers granted under Bill C-181 more excesses will become a matter of course, and we are worried about this. This is why, aside from the constitutional problem, people on this side of the House and at least one on the other side have risen repeatedly to make their views heard. Canadians need some kind of officially constituted review board, not a review board that operates on sufferance. It has been said repeatedly that special powers need special kinds of protection. One of Parliament's hangups has been that while the federal government passes and transfers these awesome powers to the attorneys general of the various provinces, our federal government has no responsibility for the control of them.

As I said yesterday, trust is a wonderful thing and so is faith, but so often these are not enough. We have heard that all members of the FLQ are not necessarily terrorists. I do not know whether that makes them any more acceptable; certainly terrorists are unacceptable in this country. Canadians have had very little experience with terrorist behaviour. If FLQ members are not terrorists, then what are they and what are they doing? Are they pursuing legitimate ends through legitimate means and just happen to be separatists, a view not particularly acceptable to me nor to many other people in Canada.

Why do we need these powers? Is it to deal with FLQ members who are not terrorists but may be separatists? Are we looking for the kind of power necessary to deal with people who have not committed any crime? It seems to me that our democratic institutions should be sound

Public Order Act, 1970

enough to deal with these ideas without special powers to apprehend people not because they have committed crimes but merely because they possess ideas that may be unacceptable. Our system must be strong enough to be victorious over ideas or it is not worth keeping. We are afraid at this stage that the cure contemplated by the special powers, or the legacy of the cure, may well be much worse than the disease. We say this in all sincerity, and without any frivolous intention whatsoever. Therefore, we are speaking in support of the kind of review board, tribunal or body that may be acceptable to the government, that will take care of worries, concerns and fears relating to the excesses which I have mentioned. We do this because we think that if there is a will there will be a way in which to protect the civil rights of people, regardless of the rigidity and inflexibility of the government and the constitution.

● (4:20 p.m.)

I should like to say a few words of congratulations to my colleagues in the Conservative party for the valiant fight they have carried on in order to make Bill C-181 more acceptable to those Canadians who are sensitive about matters affecting civil rights and threats to our civil liberties. I was impressed by the indignation expressed by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). I listened carefully to the Leader of the Official Opposition, who is a fair minded man. I have great respect for him. His words and logic convinced me that unless the government does something to make Bill C-181 more acceptable, I ought to vote against it on third reading. If he was able to convince me that I ought to vote against Bill C-181 on third reading, I do not understand why he did not convince himself to do the same.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rose: This is the part of his position that I find particularly difficult to understand. It seems to me that the Conservative party in this whole issue has been attempting to ride two horses.

Mr. Paproski: Leave the Conservatives out of this.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, at least one Conservative has been left out. He has just walked out. In that party's attempt to ride two horses—

Mr. Paproski: I am back again.

Mr. Rose:—that party may have fallen between them.

An hon. Member: Not the hon. member who has just returned.

Mr. Rose: I was not referring particularly to the hon. member for Edmonton West who has just returned.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, my constituency is Edmonton Centre.