

from a foreign country might be accused of burglary. It seems to me that it is a totally preposterous situation which must be corrected at all costs. As for me, I intend to make representations in this connection to the McDonald Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I hoped that on such a fundamental matter, the opposition might also consider some responsible ways of amending our legislation so as to prevent such situations in the future.

[*English*]

It seems to me that all of us in this House have a responsibility to ensure that the security services of our country are effective. Everyone here says publicly that the security service is essential to the continued existence and survival of our democratic country but we do not seem ready, in all corners of the House, to give the service the necessary powers or the necessary mandate. Perhaps there are areas in which additional powers ought to be given to the security service as long as additional safeguards are also provided.

It seems to me that if we are talking about a security policy we would do well to progress a little more toward a non-partisan approach because this is a matter which goes beyond the realm of party politics, beyond being a member of the Liberal party, or of the Tory party or of the New Democratic Party. It affects the very survival of this country and one would expect that, when there is a debate on an issue of such fundamental importance, we might be able to count on the opposition making constructive rather than destructive speeches.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, while listening to the reply of the Solicitor General to the Leader of the Official Opposition or the leader of the New Democratic Party, it was quite obvious that he felt a little lost and that he tried to deviate from the specific purpose of this debate, because we have not discussed this evening the extent to which the legislation should be amended to avoid a repetition of what has happened. We will have to clear up the matter so that Canadians will know what were the true reasons and the intentions of the authorities when they directly or indirectly authorized illegal acts, acts of vandalism or burglaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that our citizens realize that even in this country there are shameless abuses of power. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that even in our western democracies, we have not yet learned to differentiate between power and authority, so that those who are entrusted with power think that they have the necessary authority and they put those two different things together to do as they like.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little ashamed today of being a Canadian. For years, we have been making fun of some South American countries because the authorities there rule the roost using their police for political purposes. We see that regularly in the news and we think that it is happening a thousand miles from here. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have had for many years in our own country a dictatorship like those which exist in banana republics and which are using their law enforcing agencies to achieve their own ends.

### RCMP

That is a very serious abuse which we must denounce. People must know whom they are dealing with. People must realize that for the past few years we have witnessed a parody of democracy in this country. Mr. Speaker, when a government has reached the point where it makes use of law enforcing agencies to achieve its own political ends and, which makes things even worse, condones accordingly their illegal activities, the least we can do is wonder where we will end up this way. On the other hand, the government should stop pleading the security of the state over and over again, for the only real agents provocateurs are the very people who are in power now. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help comparing this situation with those I denounced in 1970, 1971 and 1972. I remember taking part in Montreal in a radio program during which the Minister of Supply and Services spent his time denying what I was saying.

As a member of the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, I was present at a meeting where the authorities of the City of Montreal appeared, and I heard the Montreal mayor, Mr. Lucien Saulnier, the then Director of the City of Montreal, and Mr. Côté, the head of the Legal Services Branch, explain how the FLQ operated, what went on within the various cells, and the Montreal mayor stated that on many occasions he had advised the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General of what was going on. This took place more than a year before the so-called October 1970 crisis.

● (2112)

Mr. Speaker, a police force that sets fire to a barn, breaks into a press agency, steals lists of members of a democratically elected party, a police force that allows itself to do things like that also allowed itself to infiltrate FLQ cells in 1969 and thereby bringing about the crisis we had in 1970. I know this is a very serious charge I am making, Mr. Speaker, but I maintain it because it is time that once and for all the Canadian population know that there are in this country people who have lost their reason, people who cannot accept the changes that are taking place in Quebec, people who only a few months or at most a year ago thought Quebec emancipation and free development were only velleities, people who spend days and nights trying to find a way of crushing people who only want to be free and happy.

When people have such an erroneous idea of the collective "vouloir être" of a whole nation, of a whole people, they try by all means to justify a radical and unreasonable action against these people and, as these people do not take such actions, they are the first ones to provoke them to justify before the whole country their efforts to crush down this emancipating movement which is originally a very sound one.

They will say yes to destroy the country. Let us stop those idiocies. How many Quebecers are there now in power in Quebec as here in this House? Since when did they suggest they wanted to destroy the country when all they want is to reorganize it, to restructure it so its fundamental entities could really be free and equal? Why call all those who want to free themselves and their minds, why call them terrorists, why