

*Public Order Act, 1970*

the dynamism we need to build the country and a society which will be not only just, but human.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for speculation or petty politics, but the time for great decisions. It is up to the right-minded to shake themselves and not become the victims of those who seek to overthrow the administration. Who knows but that the FLQ may be the prelude to many political upheavals throughout the whole of Canada.

To be sure, life in future will no longer be what it was in our country, Canada. The good times are gone. History is taking a new turning. Whither is Canada going? What will be its fate? Many a reply can come to mind, but one thing is certain. It all depends on how the government will be able to channel the existing forces to build or destroy our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that our future will be quite different from the past. We must constantly legislate, adjust the country to the present time, stop living like in the Middle Ages.

This is the lesson the FLQ gives us. It is now up to us to take advantage of the situation in order to survive democratically. But most of all, we must not forget that the grievances of the FLQ are exclusive to Quebec. It is a movement that makes the most of the present situation, unemployment, poverty, regional disparities, differences between the two main ethnic groups, arrogance towards one another etc... All this strengthens the FLQ, while it weakens the administration.

As I said before, we must look beyond the realities. The powers that be and the authorities might bring in the army to crush the terrorist movement which besets and threatens us. A sociologist would no doubt say that society is ill, but a chemist would say that a catalyser is needed to activate the chemical reaction. Thus both will say the same thing, but with a vastly different vivid language. At that time, if you manage to understand fully the picturesque of people, odd as it may seem we will be in my view in the process of achieving democracy.

In conclusion, I would like to read into the record an excerpt of the letter which the Prime minister sent to my leader on October 17. I quote:

It is with the utmost seriousness that I invited then and that I am inviting again today your suggestions with a view to amending the regulations, as well as those you could put forward concerning the nature and the contents of a new legislation. I shall show much eagerness in considering your suggestions as soon as you are in a position to submit them to me.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition parties and even some government members made suggestions which have almost all been rejected by the government. Thus, as recorded on page 1391 of *Hansard* for last Monday, an hon. member on the government side proposed an amendment which read as follows:

That Bill C-181 be amended  
(a) by striking out line 10 on page 3 and substituting the following:

"mental change within Canada with respect to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada as that"

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

Consequently, the bill concerns only Quebec now and not the rest of the provinces. In fact, it concerns only the associations or movements which want secession. What about other provinces? What about other associations or movements which would advocate a shameless federalism, a federalism of submission and not of co-operation!

Since this government proclaims that it does not want a special status for the province of Quebec, I wonder if its deeds are in agreement with his words.

Ever since this government states that it wants bilingualism at large, *a mari usque ad mare*, it brings in reports and orders commissions to study the problem. But when it rejects amendments moved by one of its own who is asking that the bill now under consideration should be drafted in good French, I wonder if its words are not in contradiction with its deeds.

Even after saying that it would take due note of all our suggestions, the government rejected nearly all of them and I am wondering once more if it is not acting contrary to what it is saying.

Mr. Speaker, I am also against the bill's retroactivity since it could not be justified. If any provincial or federal political party were declared an unlawful association as a result of illegal doings of one or more of its members, everyone having participated in the party's activity would be considered an outlaw and guilty. I wish to emphasize that if fully implemented, this legislation would infringe upon man's freedom to work for an association or a movement which is not illegal at the present time. If, for instance, a handful of PQ extremists committed reprehensible acts which interfered with the freedom of the Canadian people, and if this party were to be declared an "illegal association", then all the people who have been active in this movement since its inception would be liable to prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, this provision of the bill is altogether opposed to my idea of liberty. This example can be applied to my party as well as to any of the opposition parties, either federal or provincial.

Therefore, if this bill is not amended so as to be applicable to all provinces, if it is not drafted in proper French as requested by the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), and if the retroactive provision is not amended, I will vote against it.

We were told "Enough of this nonsense", but which nonsense? Ours or yours?

[English]

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, as we come to the conclusion of this debate I think it is important to reflect for a moment or two on what has been happening to us during the autumn. I think this period may well be regarded by those who look back on it as the autumn of extremes, because quite truly over the past two months, perhaps even more, we have been battered by two very dangerous and extreme elements present in our society.