

criminal law correspond exactly with the English version, they are required to do an impossible thing.

When moreover, they are requested to do so in record time because those who drafted the English text took up practically the full time allowed for preparation of a bill to lick their style contorsions into shape, then I do not have to wonder who is flouting whom when it is claimed that both languages have equal rights. It is not only the translators who are being flouted, but also Canada's French-speaking community as a whole.

I offer no solution to the problem. I am merely stating an undeniable fact, which I consider to be worthy of consideration.

In concluding, I will repeat my most sincere apologies to our legal translators. If I have spoken of them unfairly, I ask their forgiveness as I had not the slightest intention of causing them prejudice. They are, as I know perfectly well, more skilled, hardworking and competent than many other public servants, although they get less consideration and retribution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (9:00 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I rise merely for two or three minutes to indicate that the preamble makes statements which some of us in this chamber do not accept as being facts of the situation in Canada, either now or on October 16 and the days that followed.

An hon. Member: They are Liberal facts.

Mr. Lewis: I rise merely to underline that the preamble states in the second paragraph:

AND WHEREAS the public order in Canada continues to be endangered—

Mr. Baldwin: That is not what Pierre says.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, there has not been any evidence given by the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice at any time during these discussions—

Mr. Gibson: Of course there has.

Mr. Lewis: —not the slightest evidence, to justify the statement that the public order in Canada continues to be endangered. There has been evidence that in the province of Quebec there has functioned, and probably still functions, a criminal conspiracy called le Front de Libération du Québec that has engaged in awful criminal acts which every Canadian and every member of this Parliament condemns. But, Mr. Chairman, there has been no evidence to support the kind of thing this preamble says.

All through the debate on this bill, both on second reading and at committee stage, I have been waiting to hear from the minister statements of fact justifying the reintroduction of the repressive legislation which we have now under the War Measures Act. This reintroduction in the form of a new law, even though it is limited in time, serves merely to reinforce the point we have made many times. I am certain that the Canadian people

Public Order Act, 1970

are beginning to realize now, and will increasingly realize, that they were not given the information to which they were entitled for the introduction of so reactionary and repressive a measure as the War Measures Act and so reactionary and repressive a measure as has been discussed in committee clause by clause.

The Minister of Justice has not given us anything to justify this measure at the present time. There is no evidence that the public order or Canada is being threatened at this time. There is evidence of the failure of the police to find kidnappers and murderers; there is ample evidence of that. There is evidence of the failure of the police authorities to find the members and supporters of the FLQ. But there is no evidence to support the statement in the second paragraph of this preamble.

An hon. Member: What does your mail say?

Mr. Lewis: There was no evidence, Mr. Chairman, at the time when the War Measures Act was introduced—

An hon. Member: That is enough.

Mr. Lewis: —nor was there evidence at the time when the War Measures Act was proclaimed, that there was a state of apprehended insurrection in the province of Quebec.

Time and time again we have asked the government to explain what it meant by the statement that there was confusion in Quebec; what it meant by the statement that there was an erosion of will in Quebec; what certain ministers of the government meant by stating that the CBC was controlled by the FLQ; what they meant by stating that every high place in Quebec was infiltrated by FLQ; what they meant by statements such as that made by the Minister of Justice, that, the people of Canada will never understand the reason for it unless they are given all the information. Since October 16 none of these statements have been explained and none of the information to which the people of Canada are entitled has been brought forward. There was no evidence of an apprehended insurrection on October 16, and there is no evidence that the public order of Canada is threatened today.

As far as I am concerned, and I am sure as far as my colleagues are concerned, the preamble makes statements that have not been proven to this Parliament or to the people of Canada. I could not let it pass without repeating my condemnation of the government for its failure to give the information and my apprehension about a government that reintroduces the evil, repressive measures of the War Measures Act in this bill without even finding it necessary to tell Parliament or the people of Canada exactly what makes this kind of repressive measure necessary at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the preamble carry? Preamble agreed to.