

One year later, there was the famous October, 1970, crisis where we witnessed serious disturbances, and because of the circumstances surrounding these events, we were able to ask ourselves certain questions such as this one: Why is it that since the authorities were aware that certain events could occur, why is it that the police, especially the RCMP, while it found quite normal in its regular operations to infiltrate certain underground movements in the field of criminal activities or where the security of the country was involved, had let the situation deteriorate to such a point that this crisis could occur and not only affect certain people, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, but also harm the reputation of a whole nation and a whole population? The hon. member for Champlain was taken lightly and even laughed at in 1970, 1971 and 1972 when he asked a series of questions to determine how come certain events had occurred when the police was aware of the situation. All I was told at that time was that I could not be told anything on this subject because national security was involved, and this is how, as others have said before me, the government hid behind the rules to avoid revealing certain facts about which we should have been told.

Mr. Speaker, circumstances made it possible a few months ago to see that those considerations made several years ago were just as founded as the confessions of the Solicitor General who said it was true that the RCMP had set criminal fires, stolen dynamite, and issued communiqués in the name of the FLQ in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, when we uncover everything under those revelations, we will realize that we are very close to a dictatorial government acting much like South American republics which always stand one hour or one day away from revolutions. Mr. Speaker, either one of two things—either the government takes its responsibilities and it has true and absolute control over everything that has to do with the security of this country, everything that has to do with its administration, directly or indirectly, or it leaves that democratic power in the hands of law enforcement agencies. In both cases, this goes against fundamental rules that should be guiding policies of this kind.

We have before us today a motion which puts those facts right to our faces, Mr. Speaker. How come the Solicitor General refuses to participate and the government confirms that refusal by informing us that it is going to vote against this motion whose only purpose is to bring about clarifications we need to set things straight? If there was an attempt to cover up, if it is still going on, I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a way of doing things which sooner or later will generate disastrous reactions, and then do not be surprised when you see the comments that can be made on the general morality across this country, when the example comes from the top—the government itself.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we in our capacity as representatives of the people be able to preserve the fundamen-

*Privilege—Mr. Lawrence*

tal rights and privileges the people have to know how their money is being administered, how their interests are being protected and what is the general direction of policies. If a solicitor general does not have more responsibility before this House than any law enforcement agency dictating letters to him, Mr. Speaker, we have to know where we stand. To refuse to inform adequately the duly elected representatives of the people is, as everyone else said before me, to try to hide the truth. It is high time in the system we have, which more and more people see as a corrupt system, for those who run it to shed their fear of facing public opinion directly by having the courage to disclose all the side-lights of what was done. I repeat, whether it was authorized or not, it occurred. Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know under what authority and how it is the delegated authority the police was given went as far as stealing dynamite, setting criminal fires, and issuing communiqués in the name of the FLQ.

In view of the special circumstances under which emancipation and growth led to the election of a Quebec government advocating a restructuring of the country along the lines of sovereignty-association, there is a strong tendency to conclude that everything has been done for a number of years to tarnish the reputation of those who are honestly, sincerely and peacefully striving to find a way for the people in this nation to live in true harmony. That the temptation has been to tarnish their reputations by all sorts of arbitrary means, such as controlling in some way the enforcement agencies or letting the police lead activities that are unacceptable in a so-called civilized nation—

● (2102)

**An hon. Member:** Speak to the motion!

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, an hon. member opposite suggests I am not speaking to the motion, but this is more relevant than he thinks. I know of course such matters are of no interest to hon. members supporting this government. I know full well the large majority of Liberal members are not aware of all those actions, but they know as well as we do there have been actions that prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the police are indulging in activities that might have been and in effect were from time to time in the nature of provocation. There were attempts to tarnish reputations, the audacity went as far as—and this has now been proved—to discredit a political party as a whole, namely the Parti Québécois, in a successful attempt at getting a list of their membership.

Mr. Speaker, we hear reports of coups in South America. The reference is to banana republics, the implication is this is quite normal there. Well, if we got deeper, if we could finally find out how things happened and why they did happen, we might find out we are faced with an administration whose sense of democracy is no more advanced than that of countries led by what amounts to dictatorships. Mr. Speaker, we are here to protect the citizens, we are here to pass legislation