

from asking any provocative questions. Because we felt that the government should be given every opportunity to deal with what was an extremely difficult situation we have gone along with the government on at least two or three matters.

We have agreed with the government's refusal to accede to the outrageous demands of the kidnappers. I can understand the feelings of those sensitive individuals whose first reaction was that the government should deal with the kidnappers and should be prepared to accede to their demands. I would not go so far as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as to call them weak-kneed and bleeding hearts. I think they are people with a great sensitivity and a great sense of the value of human life. But I think such people overlook two important facts.

The first fact is that compliance with the demands of the abductors would not necessarily guarantee the safe return of the two men whom they have taken as hostages. The second, and even more important, is that acceding to the demands of the kidnappers would only set in motion a whole series of similar incidents, and nobody knows where the road would end.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Once it has become established that the government of this country is prepared to negotiate with kidnappers, to break the laws of the country, to release convicted criminals, to hand out huge sums of money, to publish the names of informers, then, of course, we would in all probability have more kidnappings and more blackmail. Undoubtedly the day would then come when the government would have to call a halt. The moment it called a halt it would, of course, be subject to the criticism that it had acceded to the demands in order to secure the release of some people and was now refusing to accede to the demands to secure the release of other persons. Therefore we have supported the government because we believe that to allow any group to dictate terms to the democratic, elected government of this country is to invite anarchy and chaos in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I think that Canadians must become aware of the fact that there are revolutionary forces in the world and now, unfortunately, some in Canada who are dedicated to the use of violence to bring about social change. We in the New Democratic Party want to bring about social change, but we have always believed that the means that are used determine the ends that are attained.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Those who attain power by violence and force always have to retain power by violence and force. A government that is founded on violence and force then begins to have problems within its own ranks, and the transfer of power and the change of leadership are also settled by violence and

Invoking of War Measures Act

force. When we start down that road, Mr. Speaker, we are inviting the man on horseback, and the experiences of history from the days of Napoleon to Stalin, to Hitler, have all proven the same thing, that social change predicated on violence, on sabotage, on kidnapping, on assassination, is bound to end up in a police state, with periodic purges. We do not accept the doctrine of the Maoists that "all power proceeds out of the mouth of a gun", because if we accept that concept what we are saying is that society will be dominated by those who have the most guns and the ruthless will to use them.

In a country that has not got the democratic process one can understand men who desire freedom resorting to force, but in a country which has the democratic process and has a form of parliamentary democracy we say that these are the means at hand to bring about social change.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The second point on which we have supported the government is its desire to do everything possible to secure the release of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. We, of course, understood that it could not possibly negotiate on the terms of the demands that had been made. But the government has a responsibility to negotiate, if possible, the safe return of these two men to their anguished families. For that reason we have done everything we could not to make a delicate situation more difficult in order that if the government could possibly reach some agreement for the release of these men, without acceding to the demands which had been made, it should be given every opportunity to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to a point on which we cannot support the government. The government is now convinced that there is a state of civil disturbance and anticipated sabotage which requires prompt and vigorous action. The government, of course, undoubtedly has in its possession information that is not available to us. I suggest that if the government has information that civil disturbances are likely to break out on a large scale and that sabotage is anticipated in menacing proportions, then the government, of course, has the responsibility to deal with it.

I submit that, properly, the government had two options in dealing with the situation. The first was to deal with it under the powers which it now has under the laws of Canada, to utilize all the powers under the treason sections of the Criminal Code and the sections dealing with seditious intention. There are very considerable powers there. I think the government deserves some criticism because some of those sections have not been used. There have been indications of seditious intent upon which the government could have acted. There is also the offensive weapons provision, and in dealing with the matter the government could have acted under that authority. The government had the power to call in the armed forces, and did so, and there was no criticism of the government for using these extraordinary powers if they, in their opinion, on the basis of information which they and they alone had, considered the situation serious enough to warrant such action.