

revolutionaries such as Pierre Vallières explain what the FLQ intended to do.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) complained about lack of time and lack of warning. But Mr. Vallières himself warned him on the CBC.

Such behaviour shows some crass ignorance on the part of the government. I was somewhat amused when our Prime Minister expressed surprise one night in October 1970, on national television.

Why did the government charge that some political leaders were trying to cash in politically on these sad events? I wonder, earnestly and objectively, whether the government did not tacitly decide to do just that too by failing to react sooner to these events. That could cost a man's life, but, on the other side, are there not considerations that the government deems more important?

Mr. Speaker, while looking for the underlying causes of the problems that now bring the government to introduce the bill before us, I should like to remind the House that for the FLQ boys, our history starts much before 1867, a fact that some have tried to get across.

Is it not the English-speaking majority that says that since 1760 French Canadians are the sons of a conquered nation, that they are under-developed people and that they beg for dollars from Uncle Sam?

Is it not true that French Canadians rank 12th in Canada as far as their economic status is concerned? By the way, they rank just before Italians and Indians!

Her are some statistics published in *La Presse* of October 26, 1968 and taken from the findings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Mr. Speaker, I shall only mention the main points which struck me. Thus, the French-speaking Canadian has an annual income which is \$1,000 less than that of the English-speaking Canadian, i.e. a 20 per cent difference. All across the country, including Quebec, the French Canadian earns 12 per cent less than any other Canadian regardless of his ethnic origin. All across the country, except in Quebec, the English Canadian earns 10 per cent more than other Canadians. Quebec is the only province in Canada where a unilingual English-speaking Canadian will earn more than a bilingual French Canadian. But in Quebec, as far as the salary is concerned, French Canadians rank 12th, out of 14 nationalities. It is not I who say that, but indeed the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. English-speaking Canadians earn 40 per cent more than the other people of various other origins. After graduation from university, a Jew will increase his income by \$4171, an English by \$4007, an Italian by \$3695, and a French Canadian by \$3290. As a result, French Canadians are represented in only 3 per cent of all transactions made through the Montreal Stock Exchange, and they only hold 15 per cent of all the real estate title-deeds. The French Canadian businessman is but the servant of the English-speaking Canadian businessman.

I feel it might be well for all members to read closely the fourth volume of the report of the Royal Commission

### *Public Order Act, 1970*

on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to find out what the real situation is with regard to French Canadians. It is not what one might imagine or what the prime minister would have Canadians, from one end of Canada to the other, believe it is, with his slogan: a united Canada.

Like the reactionaries, I see, in the present situation in Quebec, an abnormal situation. They chose to change that situation through means of which I categorically and totally disapprove. Yet, I do agree that it is high time that situation were changed.

What does the text of the FLQ manifesto reveal? Essentially, the situation in which we now live. We must admit that they are right when they speak of our economic and social colonialism. In short, who are we? Do we have our own little Israel to build, to fight for, to protect? Are we done for as a people, or are we getting bogged down irrevocably in the chaos of anarchy?

• (9:00 p.m.)

Who are these terrorists? Cowards, assassins, traitors to the French Canadian nation! You have to admit, they are a little of all that. But why did they become traitors, terrorists, cowards, assassins, "rejects of history", to use an expression of the prime minister? There are certainly reasons for their murderous conduct. What is the responsibility of society, of the government, of the other race? When a man catches rabies because a dog bit him, we treat the man and kill the dog. It looks very much to me as if we are now doing the opposite.

These men, these FLQ members, realized that they are a conquered, exploited people, strangers in their own province. They are people with high political awareness, who are fed up with the situation in which they are living. Many people are shocked by government inaction, as evidenced by all the movements I referred to earlier, and which have been swarming in Quebec since the time of the quiet revolution. The process of ogling the FLQ through fake governmental microscopes leads us to believe that this movement is made up of bad guys and hench men, but it, fails to show the movement's fundamental nature. We are now taking the weapon away without trying to cure the mind that guided the arm that has been aiming it.

In an effort to help solve the problem, a new definition must be found for this federation which is slowly sinking within the slime of bureaucracy and submissive and unco-operative federalism. Such is the new challenge facing our young country; build a country with the people, for the people, by the people, in one word, build a democracy.

This present upsurge of terrorism is, by way of consequence, a unique chance for us to pull ourselves together. The terrorists apparently are not bent on revenge; they would rather, as they have shown, try and raise their flag next to the one which the Canadian people have been flying for the past 103 years.

If we consider the situation in a positive state of mind, we can, I believe, derive therefrom something meaningful. Such a movement spurs us on, rouses us, jolts us into