

Measures Act last fall in relation to the final outcome of that unhappy crisis was neither profitable nor proper. The application of the War Measures Act is a matter for an executive order, and this being so I should like to see provision made for a judicial review of action taken under the regulations so that those who are detained without a charge being laid would have this recourse open to them.

For these and other reasons, the amendment should commend itself to the House. Perhaps the committee might discuss the whole area of civil rights in this country. In so doing it might assist governments of this country, both provincial and federal, as they pursue their task of trying to write a new constitution. Central to such a constitution would be a bill of rights which would ensure that Canadians shall have certain rights enshrined for all time.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, as we proceed to the formation of the new committee to consider the threat of violence and terror in society, we have the opportunity to run a circus act which could be the biggest show in town, if that is what we desire. The ingredients are here; intrigue, violence and murder. The full range of human emotions can be tapped; fear, hatred and racism. There are many brands of philosophy that are relevant; tyranny, facism, communism and totalitarianism. There could be opportunities for great partisan political gain. Every political party could play. There could be great gains and risks of great losses to all parties and individuals. All of us are on record. We can, each party at this committee, build an election campaign. The promises, the charges and the counter-charges can all be presented to the committee, but I do not think this is the job we were sent here to do. We were not sent to campaign. We were sent to try to solve Canada's problems, not to exploit them, and particularly not to exploit them for political gain. At another and more dangerous level we could emphasize differences in our work, religious differences, differences in development and in values. In this way, we could help to tear Canada apart. I submit that these are temptations to be resisted.

The government has to assume full responsibility for its role in the events which took place in and around Montreal last October. There should be no question or doubt about that. I was glad to hear the Minister of Justice again emphasize the acceptance by the government of its responsibilities. Likewise, the opposition parties will have to assume the responsibility for their positions. The facts and interpretations of the facts have been presented and will be presented in the next election campaign. It will be up to the voters to judge all of us. Beyond that, the issue will be judged by history; who were the heroes and who were the flim-flam men of the FLQ crisis. As I see it, the proposed committee should not beat these bushes. It has a more practical job and one of greater moment to look into.

I followed with interest the case put forward by the opposition spokesmen on the motion and on the amendment. The theme of their remarks was that the committee should uncover what they call the half-truths and

distortions which were put forward to try to justify the implementation of crisis legislation and to prove that what the government did last fall was shameful. They hope, and they are quite right, that the amendment proposed would steer the committee to focus on an exercise in politics.

Organized violence and terror was not invented by the FLQ. Regretfully, I do not believe the threat of organized violence and terror will end with the end of the FLQ. I, personally, reject the amendment before us because it implies that the answer to the broad question of coping with violence lies in the events of last October in Montreal. I supported the government last October and voted with it. Obviously I, for one, do not concede that the government over-reacted then or that it was engaged in an adventure. To focus on this issue is to defeat the purpose of the committee.

Even if the allegations of the opposition were conceded, the proposed subject of discussion by this committee would still be justifiable and valid on the basis of developments which are visible elsewhere in the world and elsewhere in this country.

Mr. Stanfield: Such as what?

Mr. Kaplan: Elsewhere in the world there is this threat of active terrorism and violence.

Mr. Stanfield: The hon. member said "elsewhere in this country". I wonder if he would give us some examples?

Mr. Kaplan: I can give this example. My wife and I were tear-gassed at a public meeting in Toronto about five weeks ago by people who purported to be members of the Edmund Burke Society. We were tear-gassed in a campaign which the police stated had been carefully organized well in advance.

Mr. Stanfield: So, there should have been an emergency declared.

Mr. Kaplan: I am not saying that.

Mr. Stanfield: What are you saying?

Mr. Kaplan: I am making a point and I think it is a valid point. I am glad to have had the opportunity to illustrate it. Violence and terror are with us in this world and, whether we like it or not, they are not limited to the events that took place in Montreal.

Violence and terror have an ancient history, but their evolution in modern society involves something new. There are two new things happening on which I should like to focus. Firstly terror is increasingly becoming recognized as a legitimate political tactic. This legitimacy must be under-cut. In spite of the suggestion which the leader of the NDP made during the last day's debate on this motion, I believe we live in a society in Canada in which the will of the people is expressed in the institutions of government. We have not yet a truly just society. None the less, I believe there are no disadvantaged groups, regions or classes in Canada which have any right or reason to give up hope that the democratic process can work to their benefit. More and more these disadvan-