

Drury) indicates that that is correct. There is a call for a manifestation on behalf of Vallières, a terrorist out on bail, and it reads, in part: "Vive la révolution, vive Pierre Vallières". He has been wandering around, in recent months spreading his poison everywhere. Sedition has been committed by him over and over again. Would this government touch him?

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: No.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is difficult to understand why the government did nothing. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) knows something about some of these characters. Chartrand has been a close pal of his. I would not have brought that up if the hon. gentleman did not want to interrupt.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I fired him twice.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why did you not pick up Chartrand during the last several weeks when he has been issuing statements that were seditious and against the law?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Where is Chartrand now?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Where was he last night? Just discovered during the night? The government did not need these powers in order to arrest him. Did you not think that a man who was spreading this kind of falsehood—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to remind the right hon. gentleman that he should address the Chair.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you entirely but when the hon. gentleman seeks the limelight I want to be assured that he gets it.

The minister of Regional Expansion says that the reason they did not pick up Chartrand until four o'clock this morning was that they did not know where he was. I ask him: was there ever a warrant issued for Chartrand's arrest for sedition? He has enjoyed particularly warm feelings from some of those in the government. It was not until four o'clock this morning that like the Phoenix he rose out of his own ashes. May I remind the minister when he interrupts that, on a number of occasions, I brought before the House the danger of bringing American revolutionaries into Canada who advocated revolution from one end of the country to the other, who advocated bloodshed and revolution. For instance Rubin had advocated the killing of the parents of each of those members of his organization—kill and kill, turn out the government and spill blood. What did the hon. minister say in answer to me? He said in effect "after all, we believe in free speech".

Is the reason Chartrand was not apprehended that the government believed in free speech? No! The Prime Min-

Invoking of War Measures Act

ister endeavoured to leave the impression today that, suddenly, there was a reason for action now and that he was deeply shocked. Certainly, the kidnappings were committed for the first time, but what about the 2,000 pounds of dynamite that were stolen recently? What about the bombings? What about the attempts on railroads, and what about the killing of innocent Canadians? The government, except in a very few cases where prosecutions took place, did nothing. They opened up Canada's doors, laid down the red carpet, and said in effect "come, believing, come to Canada". These revolutionaries went across Canada and they preached the most diabolical doctrines. The answer of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion was "After all, we believe in free speech". Is that the reason the government did not pick up Chartrand? His so-called free speech was a crime against the sedition provisions of the Criminal Code. Why was action not taken?

There is an appeal in the dossier calling on all comrades to attend the trial of Charles Gagnon. Was Charles picked up yesterday?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What a coincidence! The government obtains the power to do something, a power which they could have exercised at any time. Charlie has been around for months and months and the government knew where he was. The minister to whom I have referred for the last few minutes knew where Gagnon was. The appeal states that adherents are urged to fill the court every Wednesday. It reads: "It seems certain that the jury is impressed by the presence of numerous supporters in the court".

I must not speak disrespectfully of Lemieux because he is in the position of being an arbitrator, a plenipotentiary. His statements in the last several months have aroused people, of the kind he endeavours to arouse, the revolution in Canada. Why was no action taken against him? The government of Canada let these people run wild. Free speech is not what two or three ministers say it is. It is a strange triumvirate in the cabinet composed of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and, above all, their conscience, the Secretary of State.

Mr. Saulnier brought all of this evidence before the committee. He pointed out that the FLQ was organizing through the instrumentality of a government agency. What happened? Nothing. A year went by. No attention whatsoever was paid to the representations of two gentlemen, the mayor of Montreal—a tremendous power in the public life of our country—and Mr. Saulnier, both of whom dared to speak out. They were pushed aside and the government walked on the other side of the street. The government is endeavouring to leave the impression that a crisis came about suddenly.

Now, sir, I will read a few quotations from what Mr. Saulnier said. He said: "I gave these facts to the Prime Minister of Canada on several occasions". When I mentioned that to the Prime Minister today, he put up his